

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Campaign Against Tuberculosis in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], with an Associated Press release of July 18 referred to in his statement.

There being no objection, the statement and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The battle against disease throughout the world has attracted considerable attention in the Senate and House this year, and with good reason. From small town councils to the specialist committees of the United Nations, a new optimism about final victory over affliction is in the making.

Dr. Roscoe P. Kandle, who became the New Jersey State Health Commissioner this month, had some very interesting things to say recently about the possible victory over tuberculosis in that State. His interview with an Associated Press reporter also deals with other matters. I attach hereto an Associated Press release of July 18 from the Atlantic City Press.

STATE HEALTH CHIEF SEES DEATH OF TUBERCULOSIS

TRENTON.—New Jersey's new health commissioner thinks tuberculosis in this State can be completely wiped out.

And he thinks his department needs to make the same sort of intensive drive against polio by getting everyone vaccinated.

Dr. Roscoe Kandle, 50, of Pitman, a soft-spoken, slightly balding man with a varied health work background, has been on the job since July 1.

He replaced his close personal friend, Dr. Daniel Bergsma of North Haledon.

Bergsma resigned after 10 years in office to become associate medical director of the National Foundation (for infantile paralysis).

In some ways it has been old home week for the new director. He was head of the department's division of preventable diseases for a year in 1947. Many of his friends are still on the job.

SOUTH JERSEY POST

Before that he was southern district health officer, responsible for Camden, Cumberland, Gloucester and Salem Counties.

Kandle said in an interview his fondest wish is to finish the job of tuberculosis control.

"I'm tremendously impressed at the progress we've made," he said, "but we need to settle down and ferret out each source case. Our aim is complete eradication—and I think it will come."

The Pitman native said that on polio it gets harder to sell vaccination as the non-immunized group gets smaller.

"People ought to want to protect their own children," he added, and pointed out they can get free shots at many clinics if they can't pay a doctor.

CV—936

Kandle said diphtheria was brought under control when 65 percent of the people had been vaccinated, but polio may require 90 percent vaccination.

OTHER POINTS

On other points, he said:

1. Prospects are not so good for effective air pollution control because of automobile exhaust and other fumes. "I don't know how clean the air is going to get," he said, and both New York and New Jersey are "sinners."

2. The department can work on malnutrition in babies and older folks as a way to cut down some mental illness.

3. While Bergsma wanted a big program of State aid for health agencies, Kandle feels "you have to live within your budget."

Since leaving the New Jersey Health Department 10 years ago, Kandle has been in many positions around the country, including field director of the American Public Health Association.

He feels New Jersey's health services to its 5,600,000 citizens are better than the average in the United States.

Kandle operates out of a modernized air-conditioned headquarters in midtown Trenton—at 129 East Hanover Street.

Kandle and his wife are now seeking a home in the Trenton area.

They have three children—George, a Princeton Seminary student; John, Eastern New Mexico University student, and Catherine, 9.

Interest Rate Ceiling Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the lapse of 7 weeks since the Committee on Ways and Means concluded public hearings on legislation requested by the administration 8 weeks ago to permit more flexible debt management. The administration requested the repeal of statutory interest rate ceilings on savings bonds and marketable bonds in order to facilitate efficient and economical debt management and to prevent any further erosion of the dollar from mounting inflationary pressures.

After the conclusion of those hearings 7 weeks ago the committee held extensive executive session on the administration's legislative request. Approximately 3 weeks ago we reached the point in those executive sessions where the majority of the committee had approved several controversial amendments and had instructed the chairman of the committee to introduce legislation embodying these tentative decisions. No further action has occurred.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the "sit and wait" policy of the Democratic House leadership that has been applied to many other urgent legislative matters has been extended to include this most serious of all matters involving public

confidence at home and abroad in the integrity of the national credit. The Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means have made repeated efforts to have the Democratic leadership abandon its ostrichlike sit-and-wait policy in favor of a straightforward position of responsible action to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the necessary tools to safeguard against national financial crisis. On July 22, 1959, the Republican members of the committee joined in addressing a letter to the Speaker pointing out the urgent considerations that required prompt action on the administration's legislative proposal. We indicated that our reason for writing directly to the Speaker was in recognition of press statements attributed to him that "the legislation would not receive House consideration in the absence of administration concurrence in the amendments tentatively approved by the majority members of the committee." In our letter to the Speaker the Republican members of the committee also called attention to the fact that the majority-approved amendments were inflationary, destructive of public confidence, and costly in terms of debt management.

On July 27, 1959, I received in the mail a carbon copy of a document that appeared to be a statement by the Speaker issued to the press responding to our letter of July 22, 1959. Neither I nor any other Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means has received any direct comment on this matter from the Democratic House leadership. So that the membership of the House may be informed in regard to this statement by the Speaker I will at this point in the RECORD insert the text of that statement.

SPEAKER RAYBURN'S STATEMENT IN REPLY TO THE LETTER SIGNED BY REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON AND OTHER REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, JULY 23, 1959

The Committee on Ways and Means moved promptly on the legislation to remove the statutory ceiling on the interest rate of long-term bonds, because it was aware that the request of the President deals with one of the most important issues facing us. Both the committee and I are fully aware of the gravity of the problems involved.

In substance, the committee gave the President the flexibility which he requested in the management of the public debt. The committee added two provisions to the legislation requested by the President.

First, instead of removing the ceiling permanently, the committee placed a 2-year limitation on the authority granted to the President.

Second, the committee required that before bonds could be issued at rates of interest above the existing ceiling, the President must make a finding that it is in the national interest to do so.

The only other provision which the committee added to the legislation was a declaration of the sense of Congress relative to the management of the public debt. This section states the concern of the Congress over the continuing rising costs of financing the public debt. It expresses the hope that

further increases in interest rates can be avoided or minimized without interfering with efficient debt management and the Federal Reserve's efforts to preserve a sound currency.

Here is the language in question:

"It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve System, while pursuing its primary mission of administering sound monetary policy, should to the maximum extent consistent therewith, utilize such means as will assist in the economical and efficient management of the public debt and in so doing the System should, where feasible, bring about needed future monetary expansion by purchasing U.S. securities, of varying maturities."

This is what the language does. It expresses the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve System should assist the Treasury in the management of the public debt in a way that is consistent with the System's primary mission of administering a sound monetary policy. This language further expresses the preference of Congress that when it is necessary for the Board to carry out its function of expanding the supply of money and credit, this could be done whenever feasible by its purchase of U.S. securities. This language does not require or even urge any expansion of the credit supply that would not be desirable and necessary for economic growth. The language of the bill says simply that it is the sense of the Congress that wherever feasible this needed growth of the money supply could be provided through the purchase of Government securities. There is nothing new, unreasonable, or irresponsible in this procedure. I need only to point out that the Federal Reserve banks already hold \$26 billion of U.S. Government securities.

I have been forced to the conclusion that the Federal Reserve authorities have reached a point in their thinking where they consider themselves immune to any direction or suggestion by the Congress, let alone a simple expression of the sense of Congress. It appears that the fault of the suggested committee bill was not that the language itself was wrong, but that the Congress dared even to speak to the Federal Reserve, a creature of Congress.

The failure to move this bill is the failure on the part of the administration to understand that the Congress cannot be expected to be unconcerned about what might happen in the exercise of the authority granted to the President under the bill. It is the failure of the administration to accept the right of the Congress to express its concern within the statute, that this authority should not be exercised in ways which are not in the public interest. It is the failure of the administration to accept the right of Congress to place a time limit upon the exercise of this very substantial authority so that the Congress may, from time to time, reexamine the way that the authority is being exercised.

Since the responsible solution of this problem is of great importance to the country, it is disappointing that the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means have decided to play politics with it, particularly at a time when conferences were being held with responsible administration officials in an effort to resolve this problem. Every Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means must have known of the efforts on the part of the leadership of the Congress and the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means in meeting with representatives of the administration seeking a solution to this problem. They must have known that I, along with others, have been making every effort to resolve this problem in a way that is of the best interest to our country. We are not wedded to the language suggested by the committee, and despite the political activi-

ties of the committee minority, we will continue to make every effort to develop an effective solution to this problem. In my opinion, this is a matter far too important to get involved in partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, having read in the press on the evening of July 23 the reaction of the Democratic leadership to our letter of July 22 charging unwarrantedly that our letter was a political play instead of a responsible request for responsible action, I issued a statement on July 24, 1959, responding to the charge of the House Democratic leadership. So the record may be complete on this point I will also place my statement in the RECORD at this point.

The Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, ranking Republican Member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, today expressed regret that the Speaker of the House of Representatives had unwarrantedly chosen to characterize as a political play the pledge of support from the 10 Republican Members of the Committee on Ways and Means to assist in obtaining favorable House action on the administration's request for legislation to remove statutory interest rate ceilings to facilitate economical public debt management.

Mr. SIMPSON stated that the Speaker's reaction to the Republican joint letter of July 22, 1959, is an indication of the Democratic House leadership's vulnerability to the charge that if the Democratic leadership continues to thwart House action on this measure the Democratic majority in the House must accept the responsibility for the consequences of failure to act on a measure that involves the soundness of the Nation's currency and the integrity of the Nation's credit. Mr. SIMPSON noted that while neither he nor any other Republican Members of the Committee on Ways and Means had received a reply from the Speaker to their letter of July 22, the Speaker had claimed in a press statement "the leadership of the Congress and the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means are seeking a solution to this problem." Mr. SIMPSON acknowledged encouragement from the fact that the Democratic House leadership recognized the matter as a problem but he said "I find difficulty in reconciling that statement by the Speaker to a press statement of July 16, 1959, attributed to the Speaker saying 'we can sit here and wait.'"

Mr. SIMPSON said that one of the considerations that had prompted the committee Republican members to urge action on this important legislation is their concern that the Democratic House leadership had decided to sit and wait in taking action on this important measure in the same way "the Democratic leadership has been sitting and waiting on effective farm legislation, a suitable housing bill, and a labor bill that will protect the rights of all American citizens." He went on to say, "The Democratic leadership in the Congress seems to have effectively adjourned the Congress without the awareness of the Members."

Mr. SIMPSON said: "I presume if and when the Democratic House leadership makes its decision as to what is good for the Nation with respect to public debt management, it will permit the entire House membership to vote on legislation meeting the approval of that leadership without regard to the President's recommendation."

Mr. SIMPSON noted that the Speaker's criticism of the Federal Reserve Board was totally unwarranted and constituted a rebuke by a highly placed Government official of other Government officials who are earnestly doing their patriotic best to fulfill their responsibility as prescribed by law.

In connection with his statement Congressman SIMPSON released the text of a letter he had received from the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on the Democratic proposed amendments to the administration's legislative proposal.

The complete text of Mr. SIMPSON's statement follows along with the text of Mr. Martin's letter:

"TEXT OF THE STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. SIMPSON

"I sincerely regret that the Speaker of the House of Representatives has unwarrantedly chosen to characterize as a political play the pledge of support from the 10 Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means to assist in obtaining favorable House action on the administration's request for legislation to remove statutory interest rate ceilings to facilitate economical public debt management.

"It is a matter of public record that a substantial cleavage exists among House Democrats on this legislative proposal and our pledge of unanimous support by Republican committee members and the expression of expected supports from at least 140 Republican Members of the House were intended to give encouragement to the House Democratic leadership to break the existing stalemate and deal forthrightly with this important issue involving confidence in the soundness of our dollar and in the integrity of our credit.

"While neither I, nor to my knowledge any other Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, has received a reply from the Speaker to our letter of July 22, the Speaker apparently has said to the press that the leadership of the Congress and the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means are seeking a solution to this problem. I am encouraged that the Democratic House leadership has recognized and is seeking a solution to this problem, but I find difficulty in reconciling that statement by the Speaker with a press statement of July 16, 1959, attributed to the Speaker saying 'we can sit here and wait.'"

"One of the considerations that weighed persuasively with the Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in urging the Speaker to end the committee bottleneck was our concern that the Democratic House leadership had adopted a sit-and-wait policy on this important matter in the same way that the Democratic leadership has been sitting and waiting on effective farm legislation, a suitable housing bill, and a labor bill that will protect the rights of all American citizens. The Democratic leadership in the Congress seems to have effectively adjourned the Congress without the awareness of the Members. I presume if and when the Democratic House leadership makes its decision as to what is good for the Nation with respect to public debt management, it will permit the entire House membership to vote on legislation meeting the approval of that leadership without regard to the President's recommendation.

"The Speaker has unjustly expressed criticism of Federal Reserve authorities. This criticism is totally unwarranted and constitutes a rebuke by a highly placed Government official of other Government officials who are earnestly doing their patriotic best to fulfill their responsibility as prescribed by law. The Speaker in seeking to cast responsibility for this Democratic caused stalemate on the Federal Reserve authorities is criticizing recognized monetary authorities who are conducting themselves with impeccable propriety on this important issue. In his criticism of the Federal Reserve the Speaker seems unmindful of the virtually unanimous criticism expressed by financial

writers of the amendments tentatively approved by the Democratic majority on the Committee on Ways and Means. An example of such criticism appears in the July 13, 1959 publication of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co. Inc., who are foremost specialists in Government securities. An excerpt from that publication states the following with respect to the amendment which would require the Federal Reserve to peg Government bond prices:

"Some things, however, are clear. The management of money, credit and debt is an art the practice of which is replete with complexities. The means by which these arts are practiced very definitely are not matters in which Congress can afford to meddle whimsically or for purposes of advancing partisan objectives. The manner in which, and the methods by which Federal Reserve open market operations are conducted may not be subjected to black-and-white analyses. But, certainly, the national interest dictates that the choice of methods be left to the experts, and that the actual decisions with respect to these matters be left to the experts who are charged with the responsibility. Certainly, too, Federal Reserve officials know better than the House Ways and Means Committee what the Fed can and cannot do in the Government market if the public interest is to be served."

The Speaker in stressing what he interprets as the permissive character of the proposed amendment also seems unmindful of statements made on the House floor by Democratic House Members indicating that perhaps the amendment would be mandatory on the Federal Reserve.

On July 13, 1959, I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., at the request of several members of the Committee on Ways and Means asking the Chairman to evaluate the amendments that had been tentatively adopted by the House committee majority. Because I was uncertain as to the scheduling of subsequent activity by the committee on this legislation, I asked that Chairman Martin expedite his reply. His answer contained nothing that he had not previously brought to the attention of the committee before the Democratic majority had approved these amendments. I consider that his answer contained his earnest and patriotically expressed views on this very serious matter.

In view of the aspersions that have been cast upon the Federal Reserve authorities, I feel it only proper that the text of Chairman Martin's reply to me should be released at this time. It is appropriate that the American people should be permitted to judge whether he is acting as an obstructionist as has been alleged or instead is constructively working as a responsible Government official who is knowledgeable in monetary affairs to find a correct solution to a very grave national issue.

(There is attached the text of the letter to the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON from the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System).

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, July 14, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMPSON: This response to the request contained in your letter of July 13 puts in writing the gist of the comments I made in the executive session meetings of the Ways and Means Committee on the amendments to the legislative proposals originally offered by the administration.

It is my considered judgment we are facing a serious financial situation. The limita-

tion on interest rates is unrealistic in the light of present market quotations and denies the U.S. Treasury the tools essential to effective balanced handling of its borrowing needs. By statute the Treasury is now limited, because of the ceilings, to the issue of short-term securities which under present conditions of rising prosperity is dangerous. These short-term obligations can readily be converted into money at the option of the holder. In effect, they are a substitute for money, and thus could swell the flow of money far beyond that needed to purchase available goods and services at current price levels. The threat of a money flow out of hand has a major impact on the cost of living and places a burden on all of us.

It serves no useful purpose at the moment to argue whose fault it is that we are in our present predicament. The fact of the matter is we are in it. The committee is not being asked to vote whether interest rates should or would go up or down, but merely to grant the Treasury authority to exercise its best judgment in meeting an existing problem. We are discussing a crucial matter—the credit of the United States. Failure to deal with this could (and I was careful not to threaten or assert that it necessarily would) have the most serious implications. It was my duty to warn of this, much as I disliked the task. These are the basic facts with which we were dealing and any amendments must be considered in this light.

The amendment to retain the statutory ceilings but permit them to be disregarded if the President found the national interest so required did not seem to me to present unworkable problems. Accordingly, I did not raise objections, although I prefer the original.

The sense of the committee amendment is quite a different matter. I object to this on principle. The Open Market Committee and the Federal Reserve Board are given the responsibility under the Federal Reserve Act for regulating the money supply. If the Congress wishes to spell out the means of doing this, it should amend the Federal Reserve Act and not tack this on to a debt management bill.

Furthermore, under present conditions, I am convinced that this amendment, when stripped of all technicalities, and regardless of whether the language is permissive or mandatory, will cause many thoughtful people both at home and abroad to question the will of our Government to manage its financial affairs without recourse to the printing press. To me this is a grave matter. We are here dealing with trust and confidence which is the keystone of sound currency. Therefore, I must oppose this proposal as vigorously as possible, as I did during the hearings.

The amendment limiting the President's authority to 2 years is, in my judgment, unsound. It could be a source of embarrassment to both the next President and the then Secretary of the Treasury.

I have tried as faithfully as possible to summarize what I actually said during the hearings, and not to introduce new ideas. May I, in conclusion, thank you and all the members of the committee for the courtesy and consideration shown me and my associates throughout the meetings. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Chairman MILLS.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when effective leadership must be brought to bear in obtaining floor consideration of this important administration request for legislation. It is no coincidence that financial writers and editorial comment have been virtually unanimous in

criticizing the committee-approved amendments to this legislation. Political machinations and leadership equivocation have no appropriate place in this consideration. We are confronted with the fact of grave consequences assuredly detrimental and potentially disastrous if we do not provide the Secretary of the Treasury with the authority he must have in managing a public debt of \$285 billion and in refinancing the \$75 billion of Federal obligations that will mature in the next 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, as the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means indicated to you in our July 22 letter, the Republican administration and the Republican membership in the Congress are willing to accept the responsibility for removing the statutory ceilings on interest rate on Government securities to facilitate the economical management of the public debt. The Democratic majority in the House must accept the responsibility for unwise action or no action at all; the American people will bear the brunt of the consequences if the Democratic House leadership persists in "sitting and waiting."

There is legislation before the House, H.R. 8304, which I have introduced as ranking Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means carrying out the administration's recommendations in this area. It is urgent that the House be allowed to work its will with respect to this legislation.

**M. L. Benedum, a Great and Good West
Virginian, Has Passed Away, Leaves a
Lonesome Place Against the Sky**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

MR. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in this forum 2 weeks ago I observed that on Thursday, July 16, Michael L. Benedum would sit quietly in his living room reading congratulatory letters on his 90th birthday anniversary.

But today, Mr. President, the same Mr. Benedum, an outstanding native West Virginian, who enjoyed a fabulous career as the most successful oil wildcatter in history, and who also possessed the great quality of maintaining concern and compassion for the well-being of his fellowman, passed to the greater reward.

In response to an inquiry from Editor Randal Strother of the Clarksburg Exponent, Clarksburg, Harrison County, W. Va.—the county in which Mr. Benedum and I were born and in which his philanthropic gifts have exceeded \$2½ million—I issued a statement today on Mike Benedum's passing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement as released to the Exponent.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

M. L. Benedum traveled the extra mile to build successes of both his business endeavors and his philanthropic activities.

Possibly no native West Virginian had a more outstanding industry career. He was creative and courageous but, more importantly, he was considerate of the needs of his fellow men.

No one typified to a greater degree his quality of Christian citizenship.

Mr. Benedum was a firm believer in the philosophy that man is only temporarily a trustee of the wealth acquired through God-given talents. Consequently, he had a real awareness of his Christian responsibilities.

The fruits of his labors were wisely and frugally conserved, and it was properly said of him that only of friendship and good cheer was he a spendthrift. Great though he was in the industry which endowed him with much wealth, Mr. Benedum will best be remembered for the generosity of his gifts of time, energy, and worldly substance to the church, to education, and to philanthropy in general.

From my youth, and during my private and public service, his dedicated life has been my personal inspiration.

A Food Stamp Plan as Part of Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture today opened hearings on the various proposals before Congress for distributing more surplus food to our needy, particularly through H.R. 1359, my bill to establish a food stamp plan. I appreciate very much the courtesy and kindness of Chairman COOLEY in permitting me to open the hearings and to discuss the proposed mechanics of a food stamp plan. I suggested today that H.R. 1359 be made a part of Public Law 480 for reasons I think are persuasive.

Because of the widespread interest among so many Members of Congress in the food stamp issue, as demonstrated last year in the 197 to 187 rollcall vote we had here on August 18 on this same measure, and as demonstrated by the many questions and comments made by members of the Committee on Agriculture during the 2 hours I testified this morning, I believe a good purpose might be served by placing my testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for general review.

TABLE SHOWS PERCENTAGES OF RELIEF RECIPIENTS RECEIVING FOOD

I am also submitting for printing in the RECORD, a breakdown I have made of the reports and statistics from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as to the number of public assistance beneficiaries in each State, on

the one hand, and of reports from the Department of Agriculture on the number of such welfare recipients receiving surplus food under the present distribution program. I have then struck the rough percentage figures to show what proportion of the provably most needy people in each State is actually receiving surplus food under the present program. These, I emphasize, are approximate rather than exact figures as to welfare recipients, but I have doublechecked them over a period of several months and I know they vary month to month within a very narrow range from those I have used.

Under unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit, first, my testimony this morning as follows:

AIDING THE FARMER BY PROVIDING MILLIONS OF NEW CUSTOMERS FOR NUTRITIOUS FOODS THROUGH A FOOD STAMP PLAN

(Testimony of Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, before House Committee on Agriculture at opening of hearings on H.R. 1359 by Mrs. SULLIVAN, and related bills for establishing a food stamp plan for distribution of surplus food to the needy, Thursday, July 30, 1959, 10 a.m.)

Chairman COOLEY and members of the committee, I am grateful to the chairman for scheduling full committee hearings on this legislation. In the three previous Congresses in which I have introduced this bill—or one very much like it—the hearings were usually conducted by subcommittee and I found afterward that the committee members who opposed the plan most vigorously in committee or on the House floor were almost always those who had not participated in the subcommittee hearings and thus, perhaps, were not fully aware of the opportunities provided in this legislation not only to help our needy but to help the farmer, too.

H.R. 1359, by the way, is the same bill which a majority of the members of this committee voted for last year and which a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives also supported in a roll call vote on August 18, on which the tally was 196 to 187. As you know, the bill was considered under suspension of the rules requiring a two-thirds majority, so the bill did not pass despite majority support.

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS HAVE INADEQUATE DIETS

This year, I trust we can finally see it enacted. Many of those on the Republican side of the House who opposed the bill last August are no longer in Congress and their successors, I trust, will support this kind of bill to assure a better diet for the 7,000,000 or more Americans not now able to afford minimum levels of nutrition.

We are now sending frozen chickens to the United Arab Republic, and other foods of all kinds to Yugoslavia, Poland, India, and other countries all over the world—yet for our neediest here, we can provide only some corn meal or wheat flour, some powdered milk, and that's about all. We should be ashamed of ourselves for permitting this situation to exist, in the midst of such abundance of food—a blessing from God. The surplus is such that we are desperately trying to give it away and dump it all over the world and are in effect paying some countries to take it away. We even subsidize the shipping in some cases—pay the ocean transportation costs.

BILLIONS SPENT IN FEEDING HUNGRY OF OTHER COUNTRIES

This committee has just completed extensive hearings on Public Law 480, the basic

legislation for foreign distribution of surplus American food. We have spent many billions in giving food away overseas in these past 5 years. I am not against aiding the people of other nations, sharing our abundance with them, promoting peace by helping to feed the hungry. I merely want to point out that we also have hungry people here. And we are not doing, in proportion, nearly as much for them as we are for the underprivileged and undernourished of other lands. The figures prove it. More surplus food is sent as a giveaway overseas than is donated in the United States—even including the gifts of food to the school lunch program.

AMEND PUBLIC LAW 480 TO INCLUDE FOOD STAMP PLAN AND GIVE FIRST PRIORITY ON SURPLUS FOR OUR OWN NEEDY

Since Public Law 480 includes in title III, authority for domestic distribution of surplus food to our needy, and since Public Law 480 will shortly have to come before the House for renewal and extension, I would like to suggest now that H.R. 1359 be written into Public Law 480 as an additional program. The language for accomplishing that could be worked out easily and quickly, and we would thereby achieve two important purposes: One, we would assure that the first priority on distribution of foods in surplus go to our own needy rather than to the needy of other countries—under present law, the Department of Agriculture apparently contends it is not permitted to give away some surplus items here if any foreign country wants to arrange to obtain those same items under Public Law 480; and secondly, we would assure prompt House consideration of this plan as a logical provision of legislation dealing with the whole question of surplus distribution. We saw last year how H.R. 13067 was locked up in the Rules Committee so that it could come up for a vote only under the suspension of the rules procedure which led to its demise.

I believe Chairman COOLEY agrees with me that this bill now belongs as part of Public Law 480, and I earnestly urge that it be so included.

HARD CORE OF 7 MILLION NEEDY

Now, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, let me tell you why I think this legislation is so vital not only to our own needy but to the American farmer as well. We have, as I said, more than 7 million Americans not now able to buy even the barest minimum diet. These are the people on various forms of public assistance. They are—most of them—in dire need in either good times or bad. They form a hard core of the needy aged, the needy disabled, the blind, the families without income except what comes from public agencies or private charities. Their monthly checks do not cover minimum needs. In addition, in bad times—in recession—the ranks of the needy are swelled by millions more temporarily without jobs who may have used up their unemployment benefits—or who were not eligible for unemployment compensation. Many of them cannot get on public assistance regardless of need, in certain States, if they are "employable." Nevertheless, they still have to eat.

Here in Washington, in the Nation's Capital, Eve Edstrom of the Washington Post did a heartrending series of articles a year or so ago about hungry children rooting in garbage cans for something to eat. Out of this came a surplus distribution program here and a movement to provide more school lunches. But the problem Eve Edstrom wrote about in Washington was not an isolated one—it can be duplicated in cities all over America.

PRESENT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM A FAILURE

We have the food. We have, as I said, such an abundance of food, it is now considered by Mr. Benson to be a great calamity.

It could be a great blessing if properly used. It is not now properly used to help our own needy—that is clear and undeniable.

True, we have a surplus distribution program in operation in this country. But it is a very inadequate program. Only one-third of our counties participate in it because of its cost. And the figures show, too, that only one-third of our public assistance recipients throughout the country receive any of the food—2½ million out of 7 million. If you take into account another fact, the statistics are even more discouraging—of the 2½ million relief recipients receiving surplus food, 400,000 are in Puerto Rico, one-quarter million each are in New York and Pennsylvania and Michigan. Another 175,000 are concentrated in Mississippi. For the rest of the States, therefore, in most cases anyway, far fewer than one-third of the relief recipients receive any surplus food. For instance, in the chairman's State of North Carolina, there are nearly 180,000 people on various forms of public assistance, but none of them receives any surplus food. In South Carolina there are 85,000 on public assistance, but none of them receives surplus food. It is not distributed to the public assistance people in Oregon, Nebraska, Louisiana, Idaho, Florida, or Delaware, to name a few. In my State, Missouri, only about 15 percent of the people on public assistance receive surplus food; in Texas and Wisconsin it is about the same; in California it is about 3 percent; in Georgia about 8 percent; in Massachusetts about 2 percent; in North Dakota about 4 percent; the same in Washington State, and so on. Of course, some of the States do much better than that, but on the whole it is a very spotty program as to coverage, and a completely unsatisfactory program in operation. It is a cruel hoax—a fraud—an illusion.

Any member of this committee who would disagree with me on that has just not bothered to go down to the distribution centers in the cities of our country and see this program in operation—not just in the distressed mining areas, but in any large city participating. People—old people, crippled, undernourished people—stand in long lines once a month or so to obtain big bags of flour or corn meal and some dried skim milk they cannot carry. There used to be some cheese and butter—but not now. Once, years ago, there was some canned beef. That was disposed of in one vast splurge—and then it was gone and there was never any more.

NO VARIETY IN FOODS DISTRIBUTED

When you investigate this present distribution system in places like Kentucky, West Virginia, the mining areas of Pennsylvania and Ohio and elsewhere, or talk to Members of Congress from those areas, you find it is a scandal—a crime against humanity. The costs of distribution far outweigh the value of the food. There is no variety.

Those are strong words, and I mean every one of them. I don't care how fine—how pious and decent—Mr. Benson and his aides may be in their personal lives—in this program they are participating in a cruel and inhumane thing when you stop to consider how much good—how much real good—could be accomplished with this surplus food. Even the chairman of the Republican National Committee concedes it is woefully inadequate. Of course, he blames the law for that; I blame the administration of the law.

Let me point out something that every one of you knows better than I—that the farmers of this country—most of them—are in real difficulty. You have struggled to devise legislation which can help the farmer, and you have received precious little help from the administration. And now you find that the House Members from city dis-

tricts like mine are looking more and more askance at your proposals for aiding agriculture.

CITY FOLKS SEE NO RELATION TO FARM PROGRAMS

Why? Not because we are against the farmer. We know the farmer must be prosperous if the goods we make in the cities are to be sold. A prosperous farmer is a good customer for city industry.

But if I may say so, I would point out that most—nearly all—legislation you bring forward to aid the farmer neglects completely to tie your objective of reasonable farm prices into the companion problem of helping us to assure an adequate diet for all of our citizens. A food stamp program would establish that bond. It would provide at least 7 million new customers—regular customers—for the output of the average farm. Can you devise any better legislative device for increasing the consumption of farm commodities than by bringing in more customers—regular customers—for food items those people are not now buying?

FOOD STAMPS WOULD COVER ALL FOODS IN SURPLUS SUPPLY

As I have set up the program under H.R. 1359, the food stamp plan would provide for distribution through the stores of not just the storable surpluses but of the kind of foods, too, which can be acquired under section 32. We all know the Department has not used section 32 authority as Congress intended it to be used to help the farmer. We have had to force its greater use in the school lunch program, for instance.

There is no reason—no good reason—why fresh fruits and vegetables, and meats, when they are in such surplus as to cause marketing difficulties and depressed farm prices, cannot be utilized in season in a food stamp plan. There are hundreds of millions of dollars set aside each year from customs receipts—30 percent of customs receipts—for use in removing farm surpluses from the market. We have the maximum permissible annual carryover of \$300 million in this fund, plus the additional \$200 million or more made available each year—much of which is never used.

IS SECTION 32 WORTH CONTINUING?

This raises the question: If section 32 funds are not to be used both to help the farmer and the needy, then why continue section 32? By what right should this money be made available each year just to help the farmer, if no one else gets any benefit from it? If we cannot use it both to help the farmer and the needy in our cities, by providing more variety in the diets of our 7 million at the bottom of the economic ladder—people who go without the kind of food they need—then it seems to me that the usefulness of the section 32 program is over as far as the average citizen and taxpayer is concerned.

We all pay tariffs on imported goods, and the farmer no more so than anyone else. This fund has in it \$500 million right now which could be used to reduce the national debt, if it is not going to be used to help those who need help. A food stamp plan, on the other hand, would provide a real incentive to the full use of the section 32 funds and authority.

DIRECT FARM PAYMENTS EXCEED 1 BILLION YEARLY

One last point and then I will try to answer your questions:

It has been suggested by some of the members of this committee that relief—public welfare—is not the job of the Department of Agriculture. That is true. But it seems to me that in first accumulating billions upon billions of dollars worth of food, then in dumping billions of dollars worth of food

overseas for currencies we will probably never use to any significant extent except to give it back to the countries involved, and now in paying out more than \$1 billion a year in direct cash payments to farmers, and another billion a year just to store our surplus food—there should also be room—there must be room—in such a program to aid the farmer by getting him more customers—7 or 8 million more regular customers each week for fresh eggs and fresh milk and an occasional half pound of bacon, or some fresh fruits and vegetables in season, or some chickens—all items at present well under parity.

WHY POWDER EGGS AND MILK?

We now buy up milk and eggs and powder them and give the powdered milk and powdered eggs away. Why not give out fresh milk and fresh eggs? Eggs are only at 58 percent of parity. We seem to be able to send chickens to Egypt but we can't provide them to our poorest here even though the price to the farmer is at 56 percent of parity. Apples here are at 53 percent of parity. Citrus fruits go up and down—they're up now—but often they are way down. Why not distribute some surplus oranges or grapefruit in season to our provable needy? A food stamp plan provides the machinery for using our surplus—not storing it or dumping it.

I do not agree with some Members who believe the surplus distribution program should be switched over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would mean complete duplication in two separate departments of surplus food distribution systems—one for the needy, another for the school lunch and other programs. The responsibility for using this food properly—effectively—lies in the Department of Agriculture, although my bill also includes consultation with Health, Education, and Welfare, and also Labor. The Agriculture Department has failed to use its authority to institute any effective food distribution program. Congress must force it to be done.

FOOD STAMP PLAN SAFER FROM VETO IN PUBLIC LAW 480

The only effective way of accomplishing that now would appear to be through the inclusion of a food stamp plan as part of Public Law 480. I am not unmindful of the fact that a veto could stop my food stamp bill much more effectively standing by itself than as part of Public Law 480, which the administration wants and needs. I ask your help, therefore, in working it out in this fashion.

And I sincerely believe that such a step would be one of the most effective things you could do at this point to help the hard-pressed small farmer who raises the varieties of foods needed for an adequate diet. Adding 7 or 8 million Americans to the number of his customers able to obtain a decent diet would be a tremendous help in boosting farm sales and farmers' income.

Thank you.

STATISTICS ON RELIEF RECIPIENTS RECEIVING SURPLUS FOOD

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit the tabulation I have prepared on the number of persons in each State on various forms of public assistance, the number of such persons and the percentage of such persons receiving surplus food under the present distribution system. The figures, as I said, are rough—but generally accurate:

TABULATION PREPARED BY REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN SHOWING STATE-BY-STATE PARTICIPATION IN PRESENT FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM BY PERSONS ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The following figures and percentages are rough approximations based on monthly estimates from the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare and on periodic reports from Department of Agriculture. There may be some variation from month to month:

State	Number on assistance	Number on assistance receiving food	Approximate percentage welfare class receiving
Alabama.....	207,000	46,000	22.0
Alaska.....	6,410	0	0
Arizona.....	46,000	21,000	45.0
Arkansas.....	98,000	89,000	90.0
California.....	622,000	20,000	3.0
Colorado.....	93,000	20,000	22.0
Connecticut.....	58,000	800	1.5
Delaware.....	13,000	0	0
District of Columbia.....	20,000	20,000	100.0
Florida.....	185,000	0	0
Georgia.....	182,000	13,000	7.0
Hawaii.....	16,000	0	0
Idaho.....	16,000	0	0
Illinois.....	114,000	58,000	50.0
Indiana.....	91,000	49,000	55.0
Iowa.....	80,000	45,000	55.0
Kansas.....	62,000	12,000	20.0
Kentucky.....	150,000	75,000	50.0
Louisiana.....	251,000	0	0
Maine.....	44,000	26,000	58.0
Maryland.....	50,000	22,000	49.0
Massachusetts.....	168,000	4,000	2.0
Michigan.....	316,000	220,000	70.0
Minnesota.....	109,000	27,000	25.0
Mississippi.....	175,000	150,000	86.0
Missouri.....	245,000	35,000	14.0
Montana.....	24,000	235	1.0
Nebraska.....	35,000	0	0
Nevada.....	8,000	853	10.0
New Hampshire.....	15,000	4,600	30.0
New Jersey.....	96,000	14,000	15.0
New Mexico.....	39,000	29,000	75.0
New York.....	509,000	262,000	50.0
North Carolina.....	179,000	0	0
North Dakota.....	18,000	769	4.0
Ohio.....	345,000	61,000	18.0
Oklahoma.....	181,000	113,000	62.0
Oregon.....	58,000	0	0
Pennsylvania.....	362,000	271,000	75.0
Puerto Rico.....	239,000	400,000	165.0
Rhode Island.....	36,000	8,600	24.0
South Carolina.....	85,000	0	0
South Dakota.....	24,000	13,500	57.0
Tennessee.....	147,000	36,000	25.0
Texas.....	368,000	47,000	13.0
Utah.....	28,000	18,000	65.0
Vermont.....	15,000	4,700	31.0
Virgin Islands.....	1,700	0	0
Virginia.....	66,000	6,900	10.0
Washington.....	139,000	5,000	4.0
West Virginia.....	109,000	85,000	78.0
Wisconsin.....	107,000	17,000	16.0
Wyoming.....	8,800	5,000	57.0

¹ Estimates of persons on public assistance from HEW; estimates of persons on public assistance receiving surplus food from Department of Agriculture.

TEXT OF H.R. 1359

Mr. Speaker, because the bill itself clearly outlines the proposed mechanics of an effective food stamp plan in language which I believe is clear and understandable, I now submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD the full text of H.R. 1359 as follows:

[86th Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, January 7, 1959, Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture]

H.R. 1359

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of \$1,000,000,000 worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and dispose in a beneficial manner of food commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture in carrying out price support operations or diverted from the normal channels of trade

and commerce under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible, but not later than January 1, 1960, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system such surplus food commodities.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in commercially packaged form, preferably through normal channels of trade;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this Act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2(1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2(3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this Act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this Act to a value of up to \$1,000,000,000, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this Act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other

low income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this Act by reason of section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Fleet of Mercy Ships To Help World's Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], with two editorials referred to in his statement.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLEET OF MERCY SHIPS TO HELP WORLD'S SICK

Earlier this year I was happy to have an opportunity to add my name to a bill known as the Food for Peace Act, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY. Its objective is to help build essential world conditions of peace through use of our agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger. This presented, to my mind, a really effective means of promoting our foreign policy objectives. And now to broaden this whole concept has come a most imaginative proposal as a sort of followup to the food for peace idea. I refer to the proposal of Comdr. Frank Manson, of the U.S. Navy, to send mercy ships—grain ships, hospital ships, education ships—as a great white fleet designed to make the benefits of the free-enterprise system available to the entire human race.

Obviously, we have no illusions that such a fleet will bring peace to the world in one sweeping movement but again, it is another step in our progress toward peace—a bit at a time. As Commander Manson says: "American leadership can prevent the people of the world from losing hope."

I submit that this proposal will have great dramatic impact and will, I believe, capture the imagination of every American. As evidence of how this thought has already caught hold, Senator HUMPHREY has introduced legislation in this body to provide two such white fleets.

We are presented here with a unique and challenging opportunity which will hold much good for America and for the entire world. I attach hereto editorials from the July 25 Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, and the July 29 issue of the Asbury Park Press.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, July 25, 1959]

FLEET OF MERCY SHIPS TO HELP WORLD'S SICK

With so much talk of war and destruction, it is refreshing to read of the history-making food-for-peace program before Congress and described in today's Allen-Scott report, and the plan of youthful Comdr. Frank Manson of the U.S. Navy to send mercy ships around the world as revealed in this week's Life magazine.

We will let Robert Allen and Paul Scott describe for you how U.S. food surpluses could be used in undeveloped countries and explain Manson's idea which grew out of the things he witnessed, as did thousands of other American servicemen, at the close of World War II.

"I saw diseased, destitute, and poverty-stricken people living on the rimland of Asia, Europe, and Africa . . . some actually dying on the streets of starvation and disease," he said. For 10 years these sights were relived in Manson's mind until on a December afternoon in 1957 the plan evolved as he was thumbing through a photographic file in his Pentagon office. This includes pictures of auxiliary and hospital ships.

Why not, he mused, have an entire fleet of mercy ships—grain ships, hospital ships, education ships, power ships—a fleet designed to make the benefits of the free enterprise system available to the entire human race. It was one of those large and simple ideas which, once formulated, surprises you that it wasn't thought of sooner.

Manson, who is now on duty with U.S. Navy headquarters in London, has no illusions that a fleet of mercy ships will bring peace to the world in one sweeping movement. But he is convinced his plan will bring people closer to people and therein lies a road to peace.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press, July 29, 1959]

A NEW WHITE FLEET

Fifty-two years have passed since that day in 1907 when President Theodore Roosevelt sent 16 U.S. battleships on a tour around the world. Many shore residents will recall the day of the ships' return when, gleaming white and flag-bedecked, they steamed past Asbury Park and headed for New York harbor. The impressive armada became known throughout the world as the Great White Fleet.

Five decades later a naval officer, Comdr. Frank Manson, seeks to re-create this fleet and use it, in a different way, to impress the world. This time we would not seek to awe the world with our display of might but rather demonstrate our love of peace and our spirit of good will toward other nations. We would take this fleet from mothballs and commission it as an angel of mercy. Instead of armament it would carry food and medicine and it would visit any port of call which asked for its services. It would show the world that our New White Fleet is just as powerful as its prototype of 1907 and that good will can win as many battles as force.

There can be no doubt of the preeminence of the United States in the fields of manufacturing, engineering, science, medicine, agriculture and a dozen others. But in the realm of propaganda we have lagged. We have talked at length of our good will toward less fortunate nations and we have backed our words with millions of dollars. Yet, somehow, we have failed to win the friendship that should be ours and, in the propaganda war, Russia, which has never given away anything without first attaching a good strong string, seems to have excelled us. Truly, our failure has been compounded not of a lack of generosity or friendliness, but, rather, of shortcomings in our methods of bestowing our assistance.

The new White Fleet, in our opinion, would do more to spread the peaceful intentions of the United States than any other single thing we can do. It would be a dramatic demonstration that the United States accepts its responsibility to its neighbors and assumes an obligation to aid those less fortunate than ourselves. It would be an unforgettable example of the U.S. creed that those in trouble are to be succored, not exploited and enslaved.

Commander Manson's dream has received congressional support. A bipartisan group composed of Senators AIKEN, of Vermont, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Representatives BATES, of Massachusetts, and EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, is sponsoring a resolution urging President Eisenhower to put the new White Fleet in operation. Few projects are capable of firing one's imagination as this one. It is an undertaking combining humanitarianism with practicality and offering a generous dividend in good will. Few proposals are more deserving of support. We commend it to our readers and urge them to write Senators CASE and WILLIAMS and Congressman AUCHINCLOSS soliciting their endorsement.

Opposition to Downtown Routing of the Interstate Highway System Through Reno, Nev.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit a copy of a letter that I have addressed to the President.

For 2 years I have opposed a downtown routing through Reno, Nev., of the Interstate Highway System. I have done this because I object to the reckless spending of Federal funds at the instance of the Bureau of Public Roads to acquire expensive property and to build elaborate superstructures which actually defeat rather than implement the spirit of the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

In Reno alone if the freeway were routed around the city rather than through it the Government would save approximately \$20 million. If there are 1,000 Reno's throughout the country the savings would be in the billions of dollars rather than millions. At this time when the administration has called upon Congress for more money with a warning that unless Congress acts promptly highway work must cease, I feel that my letter is most timely. The complete text follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1959.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I note with considerable concern that your administration has warned that contracting for new interstate highways will be halted for a number of months if Congress does not act soon to provide more money.

If what has taken place in the planning of an interstate highway through the city of Reno, Nev., is an example of how the Bureau of Public Roads is spending Federal funds, to say that I am not surprised that they are out of money is a gross understatement. For more than 2 years I have done everything within my power to prevent the routing of this highway through the very center of downtown Reno, thus bisecting the city and causing irreparable damage to its industrial growth. I have written to the Bureau of Public Roads and charged that they coerced the board of county commissioners in the

selection of a route from the California-Nevada State line to Lawtons, which is a point 7 miles west of Reno. This point lies south of a solid rock saddle automatically forcing the freeway through Reno instead of following the north rim course which the citizens of Reno endorse.

As you know, whenever a transcontinental highway is routed through an urban area, the law requires that the economic impact of such routing be considered. There was a congressional investigation of this matter held in Reno early this year by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, chaired by JOHN BLATNIK.

On page 19 of House Report No. 292, which is attached for your convenience, you will note that the committee concluded that the consideration of a route and its economic impact upon the community in which the route is located should be based upon more than the removal of property from the tax rolls.

On page 14 under "Comments of the Committee," it is noted that "except for some testimony on the tax revenue loss to Reno as a result of approval of the Third Street route, the record contains little discussion of the economic effects of route selection. There is some testimony concerning economic effects with respect to the Sparks area presented by witnesses supporting the routing in that area, but testimony of local and State officials is silent on this point." Here, clearly, is a failure to comply with the provisions of law.

Now, considering my charge that the Bureau of Public Roads coerced the board of county commissioners in their ratification of the highway routing from the California-Nevada State line to Lawtons, please read their comments on page 17 that the "county officials who had not personally examined line J in Verdi prior to their initial approval of the line, reversed themselves after such examination, and subsequently reinstated the initial approval following realignment that met their objections." You will note the State approved line J in advance of the public hearings and that the Bureau of Public Roads had acquiesced in State approval in advance of these hearings.

Back in 1957 Frank Turner, of the Bureau of Public Roads, sent a telegram to a Mr. Farin, regional engineer for the Bureau in San Francisco, stating that no Federal funds would be made available for any route other than line J from the California State line to Lawtons. The following day Farin transmitted this wire to William Howard Smith, State engineer for the Bureau of Public Roads, who in turn wired Mr. Peterson, chairman of the board of county commissioners, Washoe County. At the same time, Mr. Turner also phoned Commissioner Peterson. The following day he held a special meeting of the board of county commissioners, at which line J was again ratified. You will note the report states that the telegram originally sent by Frank Turner and the other two noted above was obviously designed to influence action that accorded with earlier State and Bureau of Public Roads approval of line J, and that a local body faced with a telegram that line J is the "only location acceptable for the expenditure of Federal interstate funds" has little room for deliberation.

Why was the Bureau of Public Roads so determined to follow line J, which would necessitate building a trestle over a ravine 125 feet deep, when they could have selected a route around the northern mountain slopes continuing north of Reno and across the meadows east of Reno which would follow the natural contours of the north rim and require no superstructures? We are now talking about spending Federal funds.

At the public hearings required by State law an employee of the Bureau of Public

Roads made it very evident that the Bureau would not consider any route outside of the city limits of Reno. Mr. Turner also informed the Governor of my State that he would not consider a proposal skirting Reno to the north.

Before comparing cost estimates, let me first direct your attention to page 10 of the Blatnik report. Back in 1955 a firm of consultants were employed to make a study of both local, and through traffic. From this study benefit-cost ratio factors were assigned to six proposed routes. A so-called northern bypass route was assigned a benefit-cost ratio of 6.9. Third Street (elevated) as submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads by the State highway department had a benefit-cost ratio factor of only 5.1. Now, if you will note below "Additional Bureau of Public Roads Estimates," the Bureau estimated a benefit-cost ratio of 1.1 for the north rim. I might say here that the northern bypass and the north rim lines are probably no more than six blocks apart and the north rim route is only approximately 17 blocks from the center of Reno. It is absolutely ridiculous to even assume that line F would yield approximately six times the benefit that line R would yield. In the first place, highways form new traffic patterns and either improve the economic growth of a community or depress it. So-called benefit-cost ratio factors are nebulous and absurd and still the Bureau of Public Roads from the very beginning refers to the north rim 1.1 factor as a product of the consultants' study. Right here in my office Frank Turner, on several occasions, told me that the north rim could not be considered since it only carried a benefit-cost ratio factor of 1.1 while the Third Street line carried a benefit-cost ratio of 5.1.

Now let's consider cost. As I have said, the city of Reno is but a speck on the map and is located in a bowl formation. To the north of Reno are gentle mountain slopes. A highway following this contour could be prepared for laying concrete with a couple of bulldozers in 30 days. I have traveled every inch of this route on foot and I would say today that the entire distance from the California line to the meadows east of Reno could be traveled by jeep. In contrast, I have already mentioned that line J, as approved, would necessitate building a trestle 125 feet in the air. Line O through Reno crosses the Truckee River several times and one Y-shaped bridge diagonally crossing the river at the police station would conservatively cost at least \$3 million. The Bureau of Public Roads admits that the north rim route could be completed for about \$17 million. It would cost many millions more to run a highway through the center of town.

I will not quote figures because at best all figures quoted are no more than learned estimates. It is a simple fact that it costs money to build an elevated highway and it also costs money to build underpasses and overpasses. This is why the Bureau of Public Roads is now crying for more money. I would be reluctant to support any appropriation or gasoline tax bill until there is a thorough investigation of the Bureau of Public Roads. I do not understand why a small bureaucratic governmental agency can force an interstate transcontinental highway through the heart of a city as small as Reno, knocking out millions of dollars of personal property, and dislocating business establishments which employ thousands of people, against the will of the citizens of Reno. I say against their will advisedly, because I have in my office some 17,000 names on petitions opposing a downtown routing.

According to a plan presented to the Bureau of Public Roads by the State high-

way department there are 13 turns within the city limits, a stretch only 5 miles long. It was described by an expert as a loop-to-loop, shoot-to-shoot affair that would give a hot rodder a cheap thrill driving 40 miles per hour. Why the turns? To miss certain pieces of property predestined not to be disturbed. There is no bottleneck traveling through Reno from east to west. There is from north to south, because of the railroad crossing adjacent to Third Street.

The original plan called for two railroad underpasses, which were rejected by the Bureau of Public Roads. Now the State plans to divert urban and secondary funds to build these underpasses. In other words, it would be the biggest swindle ever perpetrated in the State of Nevada—a steal of all funds allocated to the State from all other counties to build a 5-mile elevated concrete superhighway through 5 miles of Reno. This reckless spending cannot be justified. If Reno is an example of highway planning throughout the country, and I believe it is, it would cost our taxpayers billions of dollars in excess of a reasonable program cost figure and would still not accomplish the intent of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

I understand that you have asked that the program not be bogged down through the purchase of expensive personal property in urban areas. I know there are highway scandals in the shadows of the Capitol which will be brought to light by those other than myself. I urge, Mr. President, that immediate steps be taken, not only to investigate present activities of the Bureau of Public Roads, but also to regulate its future conduct, and that they be forced to curb their excessive spending as a step toward balancing our national budget.

To expressly reflect the attitude of the Bureau of Public Roads in this regard during the John Blatnik investigation, I specifically asked Mr. Turner if he was willing to spend three to four times as much Federal moneys to route the freeway through downtown Reno as it would cost to skirt the city, and he replied that he was, and when I asked where the money would come from, he quipped you are the Congressman, that's your job.

As a result of their support of the proposed Third Street routing of the freeway we now have a new Governor, a new comptroller, and a new attorney general, who constitute the State highway board. We also have a new mayor, a new city council and, with the exception of two members who did not commit themselves, a new board of county commissioners. It has just been called to my attention that the mayor and the new city council now definitely oppose the Third Street routing and that the State highway board would be willing to reconsider the entire matter if the Bureau of Public Roads indicated that this was their prerogative. This should be done by a letter from the Bureau of Public Roads to the State highway department. I strongly urge that you so instruct the Bureau of Public Roads and that Mr. Frank Turner withdraw his statement that Federal funds could not be made available for the north rim route since the benefit-cost ratio of 1.1 was merely a "guestimate" assigned by the Bureau of Public Roads and completely unrelated to the traffic study made in 1955.

I respectfully request a reply to this letter at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully,

WALTER S. BERING,
Congressman for Nevada.

(NOTE.—Line F, northern bypass; line O, Third Street (elevated); line R, north rim; line J, California line to Lawtons.)

Our China Policy Needs Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on May 21 I addressed the Senate on the need for a revision of our China policy. I have been gratified by the response to that speech from my own State of California and from other sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the editorial comments on my proposals for a new look at our China policy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, June 7, 1959]

CLAIR ENGLE STRIKES KEEN BLOW AT U.S. CHINA POLICY

Any criticism, even constructive, of this Nation's Red China policy has been treated much as one might approach a carload of nitroglycerin jolting over the Burma Road.

It is to the singular credit of U.S. Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, that in a Senate floor speech he has brought our China policy out of the realm of fantasy and untouchability into that of rationality.

In what may be the first frank official challenge to the Eisenhower administration's Red China policy in more than 6 years, ENGLE boldly stepped over that nightmare threshold where any advocacy of a possible change in such policy virtually has been equated with treason.

Papier mache illusions have controlled the State Department's Red China policy—the illusion Red China was on the verge of collapse, that, as President Dwight D. Eisenhower has maintained, any forthright dealing with Red China would cause the rest of Asia to tumble into the Communist camp like "falling dominoes," that Chiang Kai-shek might some day return to the mainland from Formosa, that any lifting of the present news blackout between Peiping and Washington would give Red China such a buildup that millions of Asiatics would turn to communism, that China was ever ours to lose and that former Secretary of State Dean Acheson's policies turned mainland China over to communism.

Such illusions are a backwash of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's terror that paralyzed the Nation and the State Department. They have also been cultivated by that loose amalgam of groups called the China lobby. Some members of this lobby are sincere in trying to get Chiang's forces back to the mainland. Some are wealthy Chinese who want to get back to resume their lush pickings at the expense of the people.

ENGLE, while supporting all our defenses in Asia, called for an end to the news blackout, for making it clear the United States would support no military adventure from Formosa against Red China, that at some stage in our return to reality, we negotiate with Peiping at a level higher than the present ambassadorial talks in Warsaw and that we put trade with Red China on the same basis as that with the Soviet Union.

Even the late former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, while indignations were

high against Red China because of the Korean war, wrote in his book "War or Peace," "all nations should be members of the United Nations" without appraising whether they were good or bad. ENGLE merits great credit for his pioneering for a return to rationality in discussing the Nation's Red China policy.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 7, 1959]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR CHINA POLICY—CALIFORNIA SENATOR URGES A BEGINNING ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH MAO

(By CLAIR ENGLE (Democrat) in a Senate speech)

If we recognize, as I think we should, that our present Chinese policy is not adequate, we should be prepared to negotiate for some specific changes. Our policy, and what we propose, should be flexible, depending to some degree upon how far the Red Chinese are willing to make concessions in our interest in the Far East.

These steps should be taken one at a time and we should not be in too big a hurry about it. But there are certain areas in which we should be willing to negotiate and talk with the Red Chinese with a view to concessions to be made on their side.

As a start, we should be willing to negotiate the entrance of Chinese correspondents to the United States on a basis of reciprocity and equality with U.S. correspondents admitted to Red China. We should be willing to place the issuance of visas to the Chinese on the same basis and under the same controls as now apply to the citizens of the Soviet Union provided that the Chinese are willing to admit American correspondents to the mainland of China.

Second, we should be willing to discuss with Red China the possibility of placing our trade with Red China on the same basis as our trade with the Soviet Union. Why should they be different? There are many concessions with reference to trade in the Far East that might be advantageous to us and our friends if this kind of an arrangement is carefully negotiated.

Third, we should make it plain that although we intend to maintain our treaty obligations with reference to Formosa, we have no intention of supporting military adventures against the mainland of China—with its consequent danger of setting off a major war. This kind of discussion could be the basis of relaxing the military tensions in the Far East.

Fourth, we should assume the initiative in placing the defense of Formosa on a broader international base than it is at present and lay the foundation for the long-range status of Formosa.

Time is running out. Both Chiang Kai-shek and his soldiers are growing older and sooner or later we have to face up to a new status for Formosa. Why should we not place the matter squarely before the United Nations, offer to refrain from participation in the discussions if the other interested parties in the Far East stay out also, and ask a committee of the United Nations comprised of Asians, or on which Asians are predominantly represented, to come forth with some positive suggestions?

Fifth, we should consider the possibility at some stage during these proceedings, especially if the Mao government shows any willingness to meet us halfway, to negotiate with the Mao government on issues of substance at a level higher than the present ambassadorial talks in Warsaw. This, it is true, would lead us nearer to practical recognition of the Mao government, but it is still one or two steps removed.

Finally, all these negotiations throughout should be on a quid pro quo basis, and we

should make it clear that our determined aim is to halt any Communist aggression in the Far East. We should give substance to this determination by continuing to strengthen military and economic defenses, but at the same time we should permit the countries of Asia to participate with us in progress made in economic and cultural relations with China rather than follow our past practice of penalizing and frowning upon such efforts.

This is not an easy program to undertake. It proceeds from the assumption that our present policy is getting us nowhere and that we ought to try new means and new methods. It presupposes the active and good faith cooperation of the Red Chinese themselves in a step-by-step exploration in each of the separate areas I have mentioned. It will take time and patience but it can be done and eventually the necessity of doing it has to be faced, and so let us face it now.

The challenge to our foreign policy in the next decade is to prevent the total marriage of China and the Soviet Union. The resulting economic, political, and military colossus would include nearly one-third of the world's population. Stretching in one unbroken, tightly controlled Communist federation from Berlin to Canton, it offers a chilling prospect.

Some people think that has already occurred, but I do not agree. I think there are basic ideological frictions at the present time. China is in no sense a satellite of Soviet Russia, as are Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Rumania. China is big enough and important enough to stand alone, and the Chinese leaders know that. Our policy should move in the direction of preventing a complete dependence of Red China on Soviet Russia and a total marriage of the two on the basis of the Chinese necessity. Our present policy does not move in that direction. For those reasons, I raise these questions and make these suggestions in the hope that we can get started now with a new and more vigorous approach to a policy that will move in the right direction.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise, June 14, 1959]

CLAIR ENGLE ON OUR CHINA POLICY

A recent Senate speech by CLAIR ENGLE did not receive nearly the attention his subject or his comment deserved.

"If we recognize," Senator ENGLE said, "as I think we should, that our present Chinese policy is not adequate, we should be prepared to negotiate for some specific changes. Our policy, and what we propose should be flexible, depending to some degree upon how far the Red Chinese are willing to make concessions in our interest in the Far East."

California's junior Senator wants first of all for the State Department to negotiate an exchange of news correspondents with Red China. Greater effort in this regard is being made by the Department under Secretary Herter than under his predecessor.

Second, he believes "we should be willing to discuss with Red China the possibility of placing our trade with Red China on the same basis as our trade with the Soviet Union."

Third, "we should make it plain that although we intend to maintain our treaty obligations with reference to Formosa, we have no intention of supporting military adventures against the mainland of China."

Fourth, "we should assume the initiative in placing the defense of Formosa on a broader international base than it is at present and lay the foundation for the long-range status of Formosa."

Fifth, "we should consider the possibility at some stage during these proceedings, especially if the Mao government shows any

willingness to meet us halfway, to negotiate with the Mao government on issues of substance at a level higher than the present ambassadorial talks in Warsaw."

Sixth, "all these negotiations throughout should be on a quid pro quo basis, and we should make it clear that our determined aim is to halt any Communist aggression in the Far East."

Much of this many Americans will find unpalatable, at least upon first consideration. Too many of us are in a rut on what little thinking we do on Communist China. Across the page today Marquis Childs discusses one of the men most responsible for the staleness of our China policy. Given Walter Robertson's dedication to duty, his retirement, now imminent, should signal a reevaluation of the policy for which he has been so much responsible.

Senator ENGLE, among others, has provided food for thought the palatability of which increases when its realism is given its due regard.

[From the Redding Record-Searchlight, June 19, 1959]

ENGLE PROPOSES A NEW LOOK

(From the Milwaukee Journal)

In the days when former Senator Knowland, Republican, of California, held sway, there was little talk about our policy toward Communist China in Congress, except calls for stiffening it. The China lobby (Nationalist) rode high.

Now the man who replaced Knowland, Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, has demanded a new look at our China policy—with the aim of putting some sense into it. He is not advocating recognition, or Communist China's admission to the United Nations. He admits that "conditions of hostility" prevail still. But he doesn't see much sense in treating Communist China so much differently than we treat other Red countries.

He would admit Chinese Communist newsmen to this country on the same basis that we admit Russian newsmen, and open the way for our own newsmen to go to the China mainland. The total embargo on trade with Communist China makes no sense to him. Why not permit it on the same basis as we permit trade with Russia? Truth is, ENGLE said, that China can get what it wants of most of our goods through middlemen.

Why not make it perfectly clear that we do not intend to permit—or to help—Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces to attack the mainland? Why not end the pretense that Communist China doesn't exist, and seek high level talks on the differences between us—in particular talks aimed at the release of Americans held in China? Such talks, ENGLE believes, should be on higher than the present ambassadorial level.

ENGLE has at least opened the door toward realistic discussion of our China policy—something that has been practically taboo in official Washington.

[From the Modesto (Calif.) Bee, July 20, 1959]

CHINA POLICY NEEDS DISCUSSION

(From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch)

On the Senate floor recently Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and GORE, of Tennessee, talked at some length on a subject that only a few years back would have been impossible to mention without the risk of a major controversy. What they discussed was Communist China and whether it would be necessary to include it in a proposed system of control stations set up throughout the world in connection with possible agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests.

The unusual aspect of the dialogue was not the ideas advanced by either of the par-

ticipants, but the fact that no McCarthy and no Knowland arose to denounce the very suggestion that the United States may have to negotiate with Peiping on this issue. The inclusion of Red China has not been mentioned publicly in the American-British-Russian test bar negotiations at Geneva.

This is not the first time that the subject has come up in the Senate and, of course, it will not be the last. But it is encouraging that there is increasing readiness to discuss in this country the relationship of Red China with the rest of the world. What the policy of the United States should be toward the 600 million Chinese living under communism is a matter for argument. There can be no valid argument against public discussion. In what other way can a correct policy be formulated?

Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, urging that a start be made on negotiations with the Red Chinese, proposes discussions on the reciprocal admission of correspondents, trade, Formosa policy, and other issues of substance. The authorship of these proposals is interesting. Last November ENGLE, certainly no wild-eyed radical, was elected to the Senate seat vacated by William F. Knowland. Knowland was the Senate's most ardent supporter of the Chiang Kai-shek Nationalist Government on Formosa and a man to whom talk of possible dealings with the Chinese Communists was anathema.

Anyone who views the last few years of United States China policy objectively can note a slow but inexorable shift dictated by the practical realities of the situation. It was less than 10 years ago that Chiang fled from the mainland to Formosa, an event that was followed shortly by the rise of Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, and the degradation of diplomats whom McCarthy and his followers held responsible for the "loss" of China to Mao Tse-tung.

The gradual change in attitude toward Red China is dictated by awareness of the fact that the regime will not go away because we do not look at it. China unquestionably is driving ahead, even though at a cost of great human suffering. The workers have been told they will be expected to raise industrial and agricultural production this year 40 percent above 1958, the year of the "great leap forward." Lord Boyd Orr, president of the British Council for the Promotion of International Trade, who visited China recently, has forecast that China will become the world's most powerful nation in 30 years.

The fact should not be overlooked, of course, that the U.S. change in attitude toward discussing Chinese problems has not been accompanied by any discernible alteration in the Chinese attitude toward us. It remains hard and uncompromising.

That is no reason, however, why there should not be the widest discussion, in Congress, in the executive branch, and among the people, of what we are going to do about it. The time is most certainly coming when major decisions will have to be made on United States and Western policies toward Red China. It is essential that the people understand the alternatives and be in a position to act in their own best interests.

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, MAY 22, 1959

Time has a way of changing all things. A few years ago it would have been virtual political suicide to challenge publicly the administration's China policy. Short months, even weeks, ago it was not a subject of any intensive discussion on Capitol Hill. But yesterday in Congress, U.S. policy toward Communist China was the target of an exhaustive, carefully reasoned attack.

Current historians with a taste for the paradox may savor the fact that the attack was mounted by the freshman Senator from California, CLAIR ENGLE, a Democrat, the very man who supplanted in the Senate the loudest, most ox-stubborn defender of that policy, William F. Knowland, once unflatteringly called the Senator from Formosa.

ENGLE's criticism will not be popular. It won't cause any immediate change. He recognized himself that he probably would be misunderstood, misinterpreted and strenuously criticized. But with no little political courage he observed that "we have to start somewhere." His most devastating thrust against the administration attempt to seal off the Peiping regime in a kind of never never land was his substantial argument that it had failed, all but utterly. During the past decade, he said, we have not prevented the Mao government from fastening its control over the mainland. We have not been able to influence or affect Peiping's gargantuan efforts for economic change. And we have been unsuccessful in bringing about any kind of split between China and the Soviet Union.

"The challenge to our foreign policy in the next decade," Senator ENGLE said, "is to prevent the total marriage of China and the Soviet Union. The resulting economic, political, and military colossus would include nearly one-third of the world's population. Stretching in one unbroken, tightly controlled federation from Berlin to Canton, it offers a chilling prospect."

ENGLE did not hold with the view that this union already had occurred. As a matter of fact, many other observers believe that the pressures and frictions between Moscow and Peiping as China's population swells to a billion by the end of the century will profoundly influence history yet to be made.

Evidence continues to accumulate of the bursting activity of building and reforms in China. Under cruelly oppressive measures or not, the people are busy with massive projects, dams, railways, housing, government building. A Canadian scientist recently brought back color photographs he had taken on a long journey through the interior of China. They were still pictures but they showed scenes of quivering movement almost everywhere he went.

This does not mean a Marxist millennium is infallibly in the making. There are great problems. Britain's Boyd-Orr, former head of the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization, said after his latest trip to Communist China he thought they were licking food shortages—considered by some to be the key to success or failure of the Peiping regime. ENGLE doubts this. If they do fail to raise enough food to feed the burgeoning population he believes they must do one of three things, get it from Russia, trade with us or push farther into Southeast Asia. He thinks the third the most logical alternative. How do we meet that threat? Certainly not with troops. We must, he concedes, help Asians maintain their territorial and political integrity against such Communist expansion but on the critical issue of food he sees some possible bargaining room for the West with the Chinese leadership.

At least we must recognize the failure of our rigid policy to date and search for better ones. ENGLE has no patented package. He opposes recognition or a U.N. seat for Peiping now. He realizes we are committed to the protection of Formosa—but certainly not to any reconquest of the mainland by Chiang Kai-shek. Senator ENGLE's main contribution has been in raising the China issue, thoughtfully, dispassionately in public. It is one of the most urgent issues extant.

The State Department's blessing to two such worldly citizens as Vincent Sheean and Averell Harriman in their efforts to get to China is encouraging, if fragmentary, evidence that it is unbending. Peiping itself may not unbend to these travelers. Whether it does or not, the issue of China is there to be grappled with. And it won't go away.

The People Know What They Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after this session of the Congress convened, I sent a questionnaire to virtually every home in my district—regardless of party affiliation—inviting thoughts and ideas on 15 key questions which would likely come before the Congress.

The response was exceptionally good, with better than 20 percent of the questionnaires returned. They were returned, not only as individual views, but as the combined expression of the views of husbands and wives, of entire family units, as the projects of high school classes, and as the majority views of groups in civic clubs who made the questionnaire their projects for an evening.

I feel that the views of the people of my district—which represents a good cross section of our citizens, since it includes the residents of a city, several boroughs, farming areas and suburban communities—should be interesting to all of us at this time. Consequently, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herein the questions and a report on the answers so returned to me:

FAVORED

- (1) Economy in Government.
- (2) An increase in postal rates if necessary to balance the budget.
- (3) A strong labor-management reform bill.
- (4) A gradual reduction in Federal aid to certain forms of local activities.
- (5) Discontinuance of price supports for farm products.
- (6) Admitting fewer immigrants to the United States.
- (7) Keep up our efforts to ban nuclear tests.
- (8) A firm no retreat policy in West Berlin.
- (9) A tax reduction.
- (10) Allowing the President to veto financial items individually.

While favoring by a slight margin the proposal to increase postal rates in order to balance the budget, the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania were resoundingly opposed to an increase in the Federal tax on gasoline for the same purpose. Sixty-five percent said "no" to the question of a gas tax increase with only 25 percent favoring a boost.

Here is a breakdown of the questions, and the reactions to each:

Question No. 1: "The budget submitted to Congress by the President for the 1960 fiscal

year proposes to stay in balance, even though it is high by past standards. Still, it is opposed by some who contend that it is not large enough to meet the Nation's needs. How do you feel?" Here was the response: 76 percent said "we favor a balanced budget"; 5 percent thought "it should be larger"; 10 percent wrote "should be smaller"; 7 percent opined that "balancing the budget is not important"; the remaining 2 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 2 was: "To balance the budget, it's been suggested that postal rates be revised to bring in \$350 million more revenue. Also, an increase of 1½ cents a gallon Federal tax on gasoline is proposed. Do you favor an increase in postal rates?" Fifty-one percent said "yes"; 41 percent, "no"; the remainder had no opinion. The second part of the question asked, "Do you favor an increase in the Federal tax on gasoline?" No, 65 percent; yes, 25 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Question No. 3 asked: "Some kind of labor-management reform legislation seems certain to be enacted by this session of Congress. The big question is how far the changes will go. Do you favor a strong reform bill with teeth?" (Eighty percent said they did.) "Only moderate change?" (Twelve percent went for this.) "No changes from present law?" (Just 4 percent favored the status quo.) The remaining 4 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 4: "Area redevelopment and urban renewal are subject of much discussion in Congress, particularly with respect to how far the Federal Government should go in helping defray the cost of clearing slum areas in larger cities, developing new residential and industrial sections in blighted neighborhoods, etc. Do you think the Federal Government should (a) bear most of the cost?" (only 4 percent in favor of this); (b) "share the cost with others?" (32 percent for this); (c) "just make loans to be repaid later?" (62 percent were for this). Two percent voiced no opinion.

Question No. 5: "In order to encourage State and local governments to assume responsibility for certain public needs now mostly financed by Federal aid, it has been proposed that Federal grants for such activities as vocational education and construction of waste treatment works be discontinued starting in fiscal 1961. How do you feel about this?" Thirty-two percent felt this kind of Government spending should be discontinued; 17 percent were for continuing it, and 49 percent would like to see this kind of Government spending reduced gradually. Two percent did not comment.

Question No. 6: "To encourage more interest in higher education, science, and mathematics, Congress authorized the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a program of repayable contributions to loan funds for college students and for grants-in-aid to States. One hundred and fifty million dollars is provided in the 1960 budget for this purpose, but there is legislation before Congress to spend much more than this. Do you think (a) the present program of loans is adequate?" (52 percent agreed to this); "we should spend more" (29 percent favored this); (c) "spend less" (15 percent). No opinion—5 percent.

A new farm plan was the subject of question No. 7. "It appears that a new farm plan will be introduced to pay direct subsidies from the Federal Treasury to farmers, covering the difference between the market price for their products sold in this country and a so-called fair price set by Congress. This would replace the present system of price supports. What is your attitude?" Here was the response: 8 percent favored

direct subsidies with 9 percent against direct subsidies; 7 percent prefer the present policy of price supports; 18 percent would reduce present list of price-supported crops, and a definite majority of 51 percent were against price supports of any sort. Seven percent gave no opinion.

Question 8, in two parts, brought out these feelings: Question 8A: "It has been recommended that the mutual security program, designed to help strengthen the defense of free nations, be given \$3.5 billion next year, or about 20 percent less than fiscal 1959. What do you favor?" Reducing mutual aid by this amount, 54 percent. Keeping it at least as high as it was in 1959, 22 percent. Cutting it more, 21 percent. No opinion, 3 percent.

The reaction to 8B was decisive. In answer to the question, "Do you think we should give economic assistance to countries like Poland and Yugoslavia, which are governed by Communist-type forces, or restrict it to countries not so governed?" 81 percent would restrict giving, with only 13 percent in favor of giving to any country. Six percent did not express their views.

The ninth question brought a more clear-cut reaction than any of the others. "Under present procedures, the President has to accept or reject or appropriation bill in its entirety. I have introduced legislation that would enable the President to consider a separate item on its own merits, thereby making it possible for him to eliminate unnecessary or unjustified appropriations. Congress would still retain its constitutional power to override any specific veto. Do you favor this?" Ninety-two percent said "Yes"; 4 percent opposed, and 4 percent did not give an opinion.

Question 10 asked: "Interest payments on the national debt are expected to rise \$495 million to \$8.1 billion in fiscal 1960. In other words, payments for interest on the public debt alone represent more than 10 percent of our total Federal budget. Are you in favor of putting a realistic ceiling on the amount of Federal debt which now stands at \$285 billion?" Favor putting ceiling limit, 44 percent; would not restrict, 9 percent; would reduce debt, 41 percent. No opinion, 6 percent.

On immigration, the question was: "There is some sentiment to revise our immigration laws on the grounds that present laws are outdated. What do you favor?" Fifteen percent were for more immigration; 41 percent for less immigration, and 38 percent in favor of permitting the same number as by present law. Six percent did not express their views.

Question 12 asked: "The United States is faced with a decision on whether it should push forward or pull out of disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union. Talks in Geneva on a nuclear weapons test ban seem to have bogged down. There are many persons who are much concerned about the danger of fallout from such nuclear tests. What do you think we should do?" Forty-four percent said to "tell Russia to show good faith or break off talks at Geneva." Another 44 percent were in favor of continuing working to ban nuclear tests. 9 percent would give up the idea of banning tests. Only 3 percent did not comment.

The constituents were emphatic in their feeling for a "no retreat" policy in West Berlin. The 13th question was: "The situation in West Berlin and East Germany could lead to a very strained series of events which will have a strong effect on the future U.S. role in Europe. What do you favor?" A "no retreat" policy in West Berlin, 85 percent; partial, or "token" withdrawal of American

soldiers from Germany, 7 percent; full withdrawal from Germany, 3 percent. No opinion, 5 percent.

The replies left no doubt in answer to question 14. "The President has held out the prospect of a tax reduction if the budget can be balanced and spending can be held down. Do you believe we should (a) Aim for a tax reduction?" (78 percent favored this); (b) "Resign ourselves to higher Federal spending and no tax reduction" (14 percent checked this). No opinion, 7 percent.

There was divided opinion on the final question. "There is much discussion now going on about continuing certain so-called excise or 'luxury' taxes originally enacted during World War II. These include taxes on transportation of persons, local telephone calls, furs, luggage, and jewelry. Do you favor the repeal of such taxes?" Yes, 48 percent; no, 45 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Must We Have a Marine Corps? Chairman Vinson Tells Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I ask unanimous consent that a recent article entitled "Must We Have a Marine Corps?" by the distinguished and honored chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, be printed in full in the RECORD.

In this brief account, prepared for the recent reunion of the Third Marine Division Association here in Washington, the distinguished chairman draws upon his vast experience and unequalled knowledge of the Nation's defense needs to answer affirmatively the question posed in the title of his article. Concisely and with irrefutable logic he has set forth the reasons, which over the years, have prompted the Congress to insist upon a strong, combat-ready Marine Corps.

I commend this article to all Members as one of the most comprehensive statements of the Nation's continuing need for this Corps, our principal force-in-readiness, it has ever been my privilege to read.

MUST WE HAVE A MARINE CORPS?—CHAIRMAN VINSON TELLS WHY

(By Congressman CARL VINSON, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services)

The Marine Corps is performing a vital role in helping preserve our national security.

It is my firm conviction that this Nation must have a Marine Corps embodying its historic characteristics of professionalism, versatility, readiness, and mobility.

As one who has long insisted on the Marine Corps being provided the manpower and weapons to discharge its proper roles and missions—which Congress so deliberately and clearly has written into law—I

believe that the demands of national security require a Marine Corps prepared to discharge two principal functions:

(a) A combat-ready, striking force to swiftly seize key objectives on the outbreak of general war, and

(b) To serve as a fire brigade national force-in-readiness to support U.S. policy in the crises which will continue to characterize the so-called cold war for many, many years to come.

The Marine Corps, by tradition, experience, training, and inclination, is peculiarly qualified to do these vital jobs.

There has never been a significant period in the history of our Nation when we did not need a strong and ready Marine Corps.

As our Nation has progressed, become more powerful, and consequently assumed a greater role in world affairs, the need for an adequate Marine Corps has progressively increased. It has been evident, particularly since our Nation became a great world power as the result of the Spanish-American War, that a Marine Corps of meaningful capabilities was an indispensable element of our defense forces. Such a requirement stems neither from abstract theory nor mere sentimentality. Rather, the need for a Marine Corps of strong combat ability rests upon the very strategic and geographic nature of our Nation. While we are a Nation of vast land expanse, we are, in the final analysis, an island Nation. We are in every sense—strategically, economically, and geographically—a truly great maritime power. This very maritime character of our Nation requires that we maintain, in addition to our normal mobilization base, a constant strength—combat-ready Marine Corps to provide the landing forces essential to the balanced fleet.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am honored to be the chairman, has long taken the position, one consistently approved by Congress, that our Nation must take no chances in the matter of providing an adequate Marine Corps.

Consequently Congress, in 1947, wrote the specific roles and missions of the Marine Corps into the law, overriding as it did so the objections of the Pentagon. These provisions of law recognized the historic attributes of the corps—readiness, professional proficiency, and the inherent mobility which Marine landing forces possess as a part of the balanced fleet. Also, the law recognized the irreplaceable experience that Marines have gained from more than a century and a half of close association with the Navy in the development and application of the Nation's sea power. Versatility and unsurpassed strategic mobility are salient characteristics of our balanced fleets in which the Marines ready forces play such a vital part.

However, in spite of this statutory emphasis of the intent of Congress and the sharp delineation of the roles and missions of the Marine Corps, the corps underwent a drastic and almost disastrous reduction that was halted only by the outbreak of Korean hostilities. As a result of a truly Herculean effort, characterized by a perhaps unprecedented combat mobilization of Reserves, the corps was able, through the mobility of its sister service, the Navy, to project itself into the Korean conflict. By timely arrival it staved off disaster in the Pusan perimeter. Then, again exploiting the mobility of our seapower, Marines spearheaded the amphibious assault at Inchon, raised the American flag at Seoul and then pressed the attack northward.

Once again, in Korea, the Marines had demonstrated to us all the indispensable value of a specially trained amphibious force-in-readiness.

Of course, as you will all remember that the Inchon landing, which turned the tide

of battle in that conflict, happened only a few months after we had been told that there would be no more amphibious operations.

The Marine Corps did not believe that prophecy.

Fortunately for the Nation, neither did Congress.

After Korea, in order to make certain that our Nation would, in the future, be assured of a combat-ready Marine Corps to meet the many crises that would confront us in the continuing so-called cold war, Congress wrote into the National Security Act the required organizational framework of the Marine Corps. This amendment (Public Law 416, 82d Cong.) established the requirement that the Marine Corps should be maintained at three combat divisions and three air wings. This Congress did, not out of sentimentality but in recognition of the cold, hard fact that only the Marine Corps has the background, experience, special qualifications and intimate association with the Navy as a partner in the balanced fleets necessary to the performance of the versatile functions required.

The decision of Congress to assure such a ready force has been amply justified by the magnificent manner in which the Corps has performed the duty expected of it in the crises of Lebanon, Taiwan, Indonesia, Syria, and Suez. Marine availability and actual readiness to be used, if necessary, strengthened U.S. policy in each of these instances, and forestalled further Communist gains that could have assumed disastrous proportions for ourselves and the free world.

Lebanon, in my view, will stand as a salient example of the great dividends which our Nation reaps from Marine Corps-Navy partnership in the application of our seapower. The time interval between the decision to land Marine forces in Lebanon and the time of landing was extremely brief. The Marine units hit the beach exactly on time and moved inland with precise, tactical efficiency. As a result, U.S. influence in the Middle East was enhanced. Another possible Russian power grab in the Eastern Mediterranean littoral was thwarted.

Such an example of military and naval efficiency is not accidental. An amphibious operation, the most difficult and intricate of all military operations, involving as it does the transition from sea to land, cannot be improvised. The smoothness and rapidity of the Marines' landing in Lebanon can only be explained by the long experience of our Marines in their difficult amphibious specialty and their generations of close knit relationship with the Navy. These two services, which together comprise the fighting elements of the Department of the Navy, have worked together so long and so well in the exercises of seapower that it becomes almost an intuitive matter for them to move quickly to a troubled area and apply the precise degree of necessary military power.

Lebanon was an eloquent example of the value of the balanced fleet. Only the United States has been successful in developing this unequaled instrument for the application of true seapower. A basic element of its structure is the Fleet Marine Force, a force of amphibious troops no other nation, no other fleet, possesses. Together with the Navy elements of the fleet, this integral landing force gives the Nation and the fleet commander the balanced force uniquely the product of American genius.

Lebanon is a recent example. But it has not been and it will not be the only example of how necessary the Navy-Marine Corps team is in the long and continuing struggle against the unceasing attempts of communism to encroach against the free world. When one looks at the globe of the world in the light of the fact that the basic objective of Soviet communism is the en-

slavement of the world, we realize only too clearly that in the years ahead there will be more Lebanons, more Quemoy's, and more Korea's.

Such a situation establishes a national requirement for the Marine Corps' capability of swift and effective response to international crises.

The Marine Corps' obligation to develop the most modern and effective amphibious doctrine and techniques of any armed force in the world is thus underscored by strategic requirements as well as those of the law itself.

The vertical envelopment concept, combining the airborne versatility of the transport helicopter with the range of the aircraft carrier is an example of how well the Marine Corps has discharged its duty in advancing the science of landing operations.

This adaptation of the helicopter to modern amphibious assault is also a fine example of the versatile manner in which Marine aviation supports Marine ground forces. The relationship of air and ground elements in the Marine Corps is, in many ways, unique in modern military organization. The effectiveness of Marine aviation results directly from the fact that it has the specific and specialized function of being a purely supporting arm.

Marine aviation must focus its attention and total effort on the perfection of its close supporting techniques. If it expands its activity beyond this specific function of being a supporting arm, it will inevitably duplicate tactical aviation of the Air Force and thus be in jeopardy of being assimilated or eliminated.

In enumerating some of the reasons for Marine Corps efficiency and success, one must never forget the Marine Corps' emphasis on the individual fighting marine. There is no doubt but what a large measure of the efficiency and success of the corps results directly upon its emphasis on the importance of the individual fighting marine. In these days of great scientific advancement and reliance on technological devices, the importance of the individual is frequently overlooked. This, however, has not been the case in the Marine Corps. The esprit, the dedication to duty and the self-reliance which continues to characterize the corps is a collective reflection of the important role that each individual marine—officer and enlisted—performs in discharging the missions assigned to the corps.

In the troubled international situation that confronts us now and which will continue to confront us through at least the foreseeable future, the Marine Corps has a vital and important role to perform. It has long enjoyed the confidence of Congress and the Nation. I am confident that the corps will continue to justify our Nation's confidence as the first echelon of our Nation's limited war forces.

A New Look for the Solid South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article recently appeared in the July 1959 issue of the National Republic magazine, which should provoke a great deal of thought among our National

political leaders. This article was prepared and written by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, and expresses, I am sure, the sentiments of a vast majority of the people of the Southern States.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include this article and commend it to the House:

A NEW LOOK AT THE SOLID SOUTH—THE ELECTORAL PLAN ADOPTED BY SIX SOUTHERN STATES IS NEITHER REACTIONARY NOR CONSERVATIVE BUT A RETURN TO THE CONSTITUTION

(By Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER)

The electoral plan promulgated by six Southern States has been called the newest brainchild of reactionary States righters. I take exception to the words "newest" and "reactionary."

There is nothing new about the idea. It is as old as the Constitution of the United States. In fact that is just where the idea originated. It was the brainchild of the Founding Fathers—their idea as to how presidential elections should be conducted.

The men who shaped the framework of our Nation believed that to be an elector was to be something more than a mere rubber stamp. They confidently expected electors to be chosen as carefully—and as critically—as any legislator. Electors were to be men of unquestioned integrity, fully aware of the sentiment of their State, and ready to put that sentiment ahead of mere party loyalty.

Had there been a deviation on the part of the candidate around election time—after nomination—or were he shown to be under the influence of some group inimical to the best interests of the State represented by the elector, that elector might change his vote at the very last moment.

In fact, the reason for the electors was to implement the very freedom of choice of Government officials for which the United States was founded.

Listen to the original words of the Constitution and you will see that this so-called newest brainchild of reactionary States righters is but a return to the Constitution of the United States with all of its safeguards against individual or mass tyranny. Article II, section 1 reads:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress. * * *

"The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for two persons. * * * The person having the greatest number of votes shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such majority, and have an equal number of votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by ballot one of them for President; and if no person have a majority, then from the five highest on the list the said House shall in like manner choose the President.

"But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.

"In every case, after the choice of the President, the person having the greatest number of votes of the electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal votes, the Senate shall choose from them by ballot the Vice President."

The 12th amendment made a change in this procedure. Under the original electoral provision the electors voted for two persons; without designating either for President or Vice President. But the election of 1800 pointed out a weakness. In that election Jefferson and Burr received an equal number of votes and 35 ballots had to be taken in the House of Representatives before the choice fell to Jefferson. The 12th amendment requires electors to vote separately for President and Vice President.

But in neither the original proviso, nor in the amendment, is the elector barred from voting as he thinks best.

As for those ultra-liberals who invariably link States rights with reaction, may I suggest a closer study of American history.

They are inconsistent, for they talk of civil rights as though they had invented rights, and, with their next breath, they urge any one of the socialistic regimentations which have so cut into our individual liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

It was the States righters who promulgated the Bill of Rights. The fight for this cornerstone of all of our liberties did not stem from the northern industrial States, but from the South.

It was at the Hillsborough Convention in 1788 that North Carolina refused to ratify the Constitution until there was incorporated in it a Bill of Rights that would preserve forevermore those inherent freedoms for which the States had fought.

It was the gallant stand of men who believed in the individual American and in his ability to do his own thinking, that preserved and protected the freedoms which we still enjoy—and upon which the radicals in our midst call for aid whenever they are exposed to the public eye.

The States righters of those days—and of today—believed that there should be no loophole for tyranny—whether of the man or the State. If to believe that is reactionary, then I am proud to be so called.

When the United States of America was formed and the Constitution was written, the people of the several States were insistent and demanding that local government be forever preserved in all of its dignity and with all of its safeguards.

The Constitution specifically provided for the right and authority of each State to conduct its own affairs and that this should be preserved inviolate. There was conferred upon the Federal Government only so much power and authority as was necessary to control the relationships of the States, one with another, and the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs and unified defense.

Even so, out of an abundance of caution, the States refused to ratify the Constitution until they had received further definite and positive assurances that this fundamental concept of government would in deed and in fact be set up. The result was the first 10 amendments to the Constitution—the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights consists of two kinds of guarantees: guarantees of the rights of individuals, and guarantees of the rights of the several States.

The greatest danger to our rights and liberties arises from the tendency to merge our dual system of government into one single, consolidated system. This tendency already has, to a large degree, destroyed the Federal principle, and is, in many ways, converting the States into compliant, dependent and parasitic subdivisions of the Central Government.

The answer given by proponents of big government is that it promotes material welfare and expedite foreign relations. It is in fact, nothing less than an abdication of constitutional government in favor of tyranny. No matter under which party label it

masquerades and out of which emergency it arises, it is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Constitution, abhorrent to American traditions and principles, and subversive of religion, culture, and the freedom and responsibility of the individual.

As complex as are our social and economic problems of today, social and economic justice, desirable as they are, cannot be attained or safeguarded by violation of the Constitution. Only a strict adherence to the Federal Constitution and the constitutional rights of every State and individual will assure economic and social justice.

The problem facing the electorate in 1960 will be this: How much larger in size and in function will we allow the Federal Government to become? Is the Federal Government to establish the spiritual, economic and cultural conditions under which the several States wish to live? If the answer in a strict constitutional and American sense is "no," then each State must, under the Constitution, retain full control of education, police power, use of the ballot, marriage, transportation within its own borders, health, welfare, and all such matters as provide for peace and good order within the sovereign States.

Federal invasion of these States' rights must be brought to an emphatic halt. This includes usurpation by the Federal executive, or by the Congress, or by the courts through judicial legislation.

The real division today is not between the Democratic and Republican Parties, but between the modern Republicans and the radical Democrats on one side, who hold that we must submit our freedom and fate to a government which, whatever its name or label, will be but a species of national socialism, and those men and women of both parties who believe in the freedoms as originally intended and actually written into the Constitution.

What then is the answer?

There is already in being the legal machinery in six Southern States which may offer a solution. The legislatures of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina have rewritten their own State election laws, in such a way that the names of presidential candidates may be left off States' ballots in 1960. These six States have a total of 57 electoral votes, which in a close election on November 3, 1960, might well force the election of a President and Vice President into the House of Representatives under provisions of article II and amendment 12 of the Constitution. Also this legal machinery might well be used by the South in advance of the 1960 election to influence the choice of a nominee.

If the five other Southern States follow the lead—Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—the South will have a bloc of 128 electoral votes—almost half the number needed to elect a President. The votes in the six States now, and in others that may take similar action before the election of 1960, will not be pledged to support the Democratic candidate when they cast their electoral college vote. These votes could be cast for the other major party candidate or for any other candidate. Thus, the Democrats could carry the South and yet the Democratic Party machine could lose the election.

The framework is simple, legal, and has a solid historical perspective back of it. In the States already providing legal machinery for this, the presidential electors would be placed on the ballot as unpledged electors of the Democratic Party, but not pledged to support any presidential candidate. There would be no moral obligation to support the national candidate of the party, although they would be bound by the actions of the executive committee of the State Democratic Party.

After the votes are counted and the results made known on November 8, 1960, it will soon be known how close the election is, and whether or not a shift of unpledged electors might rob the majority of the election, causing the House of Representatives to elect a President.

Much bargaining and "horse trading" could go on meanwhile, before the actual electoral votes were cast. The prize could well be a more "conservative" President and a victory of the prized principle of States rights. In short, it might well mean a return to constitutional principles.

The answer is political independence. In spite of President Eisenhower's tremendous popular victories, the Republican Party is still a minority party. Political independence for the South provides the South once again with its great opportunity to not only save our basic institutions but also to perpetuate the cherished Jeffersonian principles of government in the Republic itself, by militant, peaceful, and aggressive action in the Democratic councils and conventions.

Disliking as I do government by minority groups, the time has arrived when the South must, of necessity, follow one of three courses: Remain in the bag and be counted on to go Democratic under all conditions; become an independent two-party section and thus appeal to vote-hungry Republicans; or become an organized militant minority group in itself. There is too much at stake for the South to continue to afford the luxury of being taken for granted. The South cannot stand idly by and watch its cherished Democratic Party be controlled by NAACP, AFL-CIO, ADA, and the like.

If this plan is adopted and carried through in 1960, the South will play once again a glorious role in the political arena of this Nation and States rights will have been preserved for all the States—both North and South. This plan is a call for an organized militant southern unity within the Democratic Party for the cause of individual and State liberty of all the peoples of this Republic.

The issues for 1960 are crystal clear. No one ever despairs of Americanism when the issues are clearly drawn. Americans have risen up before and saved the Union of States. The people still believe that this Nation will live forever if the people retain control of their government. The heart of America at the grassroots is strong and dead set against big government. The trouble has been, and is, that they do not know what they as individuals can do about it. The South has a basic answer to these wishes of the people. Out of it all the Republic itself will be perpetuated.

The Great Menace to America's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield appeared in *Child Family Digest* for May-June 1959.

The subject is the handling of obscene literature, pictures, slides, and so forth, through the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should not adjourn without passing legislation to strengthen the Postmaster General's and the Department's hand in this matter. The flood of absolute, unmitigated filth going through the mail now is something that is truly alarming, especially as most of it goes into the hands of our school-children.

There is no doubt that we could get action now if the public, especially the mothers of America, knew what is happening:

THE GREAT MENACE TO AMERICA'S CHILDREN: WHAT CAN I DO ABOUT IT

(Address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, before Conference of Women Leaders of Civic, Educational, Parent, and Religious Organizations and Women Members of the Congress and Government Agencies, Washington, D.C., May 12, 1959)

There is flourishing in this country today a vile racket of huge proportions about which the public is not well informed.

This racket involves the use of the U.S. mails for the wholesale promotion and conduct of mail-order business in obscene and pornographic materials.

I say it is huge advisedly. We can estimate at present that the sale of these materials through the mails is running at more than \$500 million a year.

The especially vicious aspect of this racket is the fact that these purveyors of filth are aiming their attention more and more at the Nation's children—teen-age boys and girls, and even younger.

They are dumping pornographic sewage into the hands of hundreds of thousands of our children, through the family mailbox—most of it material that has not been ordered—material intended to solicit the sale of utterly obscene pictures, slides, films, and related trash.

How do these merchants of filth obtain the names and addresses of children?

They have any number of ways. One of the most common is to offer, in a legitimate ad in a normal publication, the sale of a product of interest to a boy or girl. This would be stamps, or model airplanes, or doll clothes, and the like. These items are frequently offered at bargain prices.

The child, usually with the parent's assistance, sends for and receives the item. Now the smut dealer has the name on his list, and soon the child is receiving lewd solicitations through the mail.

These racketeers also buy prepared mailing lists of children's names, of which there are many. They even go to the extent of gathering up high school year books, from which they take names and match them up with addresses in city telephone books.

Recently, we conducted a raid in New York City in which we confiscated 17 tons of highly obscene printed and filmed materials. The producer of these materials had in his possession a mailing list of names and addresses of 100,000 persons, including many high school students.

If you were to read some of the solicitation material that these debauched persons send to the children, I believe you would be sickened.

You would also be deeply disturbed to read the letters our postmasters receive from parents. Such letters for example as one from a mother who wrote: "The enclosed material was received by my son, age 8 years, a few days ago. Is there anything that can be done to stop this?"

The material sent to the 8-year-old boy began with the statement: "I am writing to

you as a person interested in collecting all types of art photography of nudes."

Or like the letter which read: "Is there anything that can be done about literature like the enclosed? This is a mother's plea to you to do all in your power to stop the flow of this filth from seeping into our home. Thank you for anything you can do to protect my 10-year-old girl."

Or the letter which stated: "I am enclosing a folder sent to boys at our camp. Is there any way that this terrible literature and its source can be destroyed?"

It is apparent that many children, without parental attention, do fall into the trap of ordering such material, for the filth merchants regard their traffic with children as a major and growing part of their highly lucrative business.

Most parents who intercept these solicitations in the mail are, of course, shocked and greatly concerned. Last year, our Postal Inspection Service investigated 14,000 complaints about obscenity in the mails. Nearly two-thirds of these complaints were from parents objecting to the receipt of lewd materials by their adolescent children.

In the case of a single mailing by one purveyor of filth, over 5,000 complaints were received, and all but three were from parents protesting mailings to their children.

On the basis of all the facts we have, our Inspection Service estimates that probably 700,000 to one million children this year will receive such invitations to depravity through the mails.

This is big business. It thrives on the curiosity of adolescents. It has no boundaries based upon social position, religion, race, or location. Your child, or the child next door, may be on a list. If not, he—or she—may get on one. For the lists are expanding. Nobody is immune. Obscene mail is addressed to both sides of the track. It finds its way into orphanages. It is addressed to children as young as 8 years.

Yes, their parents will be worried—and well they should be. For it is well known to law enforcement groups that juvenile delinquency stems in measurable part from the demoralizing influence of exposure to obscenity and pornography.

Consider this, if you will, in the light of a recent report on delinquency by a Senate subcommittee. The report states that 1 out of every 5 boys in this country, of ages 10 to 17, has a court record, charged with breaking the law.

Again and again, in the investigations of armed robbery, extortion, embezzlement, and forgery, authorities find that those guilty of these crimes were early collectors of obscene pictures and films.

And it is well known that almost all sex criminals and sex murderers prove to have a long record of addiction to pornographic and sadistic material. Your children may never be exposed to this material. But they could be victims of sex criminals who have been exposed to it.

Let me quote from the report of the Senate subcommittee that studied this problem:

"There is a peculiar resemblance to narcotics addiction in exposure of juveniles to pornography. There is the same pattern of progression. Once initiated into a knowledge of the unnatural, the impressionable young mind with the insatiable curiosity characteristic of those reaching for maturity inevitably hunts for something stronger, something with more jolt, something imparting a greater thrill.

"The dealer in pornography is acutely aware of this progressive facet; his array of material to feed this growing hunger is carefully geared to the successive stages. Like the peddler of narcotics, his only interest is to insure that his customers are hooked; he

knows that once they are hooked they will continue to pay and pay."

It is clear the Congress is concerned with this problem. Much good should come from the hearings now being held by the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Obscene Literature, headed by Congresswoman KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN.

This is a problem that must be met. I personally am both revolted and incensed by this depraved, arrogant, and poisonous attack on the minds of our children. These feelings are shared by our postmasters around the country and by my associates in the Post Office Department.

We recognize that there is urgent need for positive action now. We are, therefore, in effect, declaring war on these purveyors of filth, big and little, high and low.

We are launching an intense and unrelenting effort to stop this monstrous assault on the Nation's children in every way possible.

And let me say we are confident that, with adequate public support, this job can be done.

I do not mean to imply at all, of course, that the Post Office Department is only now awakening to this problem.

The records show quite clearly that the Post Office, over the years, has diligently tried to keep the mails clear of indecent material. It has done so even while subjected to attack and ridicule by those who hope to benefit personally from obscene mailings, and by those who, confusing liberty with license, unwittingly give them assistance.

Investigations conducted by our postal inspectors, in fiscal 1958, caused the arrest of 293 persons. Our General Counsel issued 92 orders barring use of the mails.

The arrests last year were 45 percent above the previous year, and this year they will increase substantially again.

Congress, as far back as 1865, made it a Federal offense to mail obscene matter.

The Post Office has lent its fullest support to such legislation. But commercialized pornography has continued to grow.

It has expanded tremendously since World War II.

It has doubled in just the past 5 years alone.

Especially, as I have pointed out, the effort has been to expand the market through sales to children.

There appear to be two basic reasons for this rapidly growing volume:

First, the huge profits realized from a relatively small capital investment; and second, the very broad definition of obscenity handed down by certain courts, notably in Los Angeles and New York, where the great bulk of the mail order business in obscenity and pornography originates.

These liberal rulings have established, over a period of time, virtual sanctuaries in which dealers of obscenity have operated with impunity and in defiance of justice.

We in the Post Office for several years have strongly urged legislation which would permit prosecution not only at the points of mailing of obscene material, but in the communities where it is received—where the real damage is done—and where citizens have an opportunity to express their standards of morality and decency.

Such legislation was passed by the 85th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower last year. It is, we believe, among the most important legislation adopted in recent years.

We have pressed, and are determined to press, its use to the fullest possible extent. The first case following this legislation was at Boise, Idaho, and it had to do with mailings made from California and Oregon. The

offenders, a man and his wife, each received a 10-year prison sentence and a fine.

Similar cases are now pending. And I would like to say that a goodly series of stiff sentences of that kind can go a long way toward discouraging other such people from further mailings of their degenerate trash to children.

To make full use of this new legal weapon, however, the Post Office must have the co-operation of parents and decent-minded citizens everywhere. Without such cooperation on a broad and resolute scale, we are under great handicap.

As you know, the absolute privacy of the mail is one of our basic American rights. The Post Office Department cannot, and will not, violate this right, even when it has strong evidence that the mail is being used for unlawful purpose. I, for one, believe fully in this right.

The Post Office, therefore, can legally identify and take action against violators of the mails only on the complaints of citizens who receive such material.

Let me repeat that point: We can act only after the recipient of obscene mail has opened that mail, and the material has been forwarded to the local postmaster as evidence.

To achieve this cooperation on the largest possible scale, our intensified program for action is fourfold:

1. To draw maximum public attention to the menace of this racket;

2. To urge parents to help us apprehend the mailers of filth to their children;

3. To help mobilize community support behind adequate law enforcement of local ordinances or State laws when these purveyors are apprehended and brought to court.

4. To rally public opinion behind new and stiffer legislation on obscenity.

Obviously there is going to be less likelihood of putting dealers in obscenity out of business if they are not "given the book" when they are caught.

Unfortunately, giving them the book is not easy. Most of these smut merchants make such profits that they are able to retain high-priced lawyers who know all the tricks.

And these gentlemen all too often have used the tricks of hamstringing, delaying, and confusing action until their clients have gone free or received only small prison terms or fines. Unperturbed, the peddlers have been back in their racket under a new name within days.

They are also experts at raising a hue and cry about "censorship," "freedom of the press," and "civil liberties." And all too often they are able to find willing pawns to take up their cry and carry on their slimy battle for them.

This, of course, is utter nonsense I would only ask any such misguided person these questions:

Is it a violation of civil liberties to deny the sale of liquor to a 10-year-old boy?

Is it censorship to prosecute those who sell narcotics to junior high school girls?

Are we abridging civil liberties when we do not permit children to drive a car?

I am sure the answers, and the point to be made, are quite clear.

Peddling pornographic poison to children is a heinous crime. And that community which does not punish the criminal to the full extent of the law is failing its duty—failing just as surely as if it were to allow sales to children of liquor or dope.

Now, what is likely to happen if we do not rid ourselves of this social cancer?

First, we may as well concede that the obscenity business, with its vast revenue, will be taken over by organized crime to a far greater extent.

It will become a gigantic organized racket far beyond even its present scope, with millions more of our children its principal victims.

The undermining of the moral fiber of the Nation's children will spread, with the poisoning of increasing millions of minds. Sex crimes will be a spreading blight on our society, and will become far more prevalent than they are today.

And overall, we could expect an ultimate breakdown of order and decency in this country.

My friends, I am not asking you simply to view with alarm. I am asking you to view with deep conscience, deep concern, and determination.

Thorough action must be taken now. I am asking you to take part. You have both the opportunity and—I would dare to say—the responsibility for joining with the Post Office in this drive.

Help us to alert parents across the country. Help us through your organizations, and your publications, and by your individual efforts. Let the parents of America know what to do on any day that obscene mail arrives in their home.

The process is very simple.

First, parents should save all materials received including the envelopes and all enclosures.

Second, parents should report the material immediately to their local postmaster and turn the materials over to him, either in person or by mail.

Finally, all citizens, whether or not their children have been touched with this filth, can help by backing up Members of Congress and local officials in their growing efforts to stamp out this evil.

I urge you to carry this message to the other officers of your organizations, and to your local chapters. Urge your local members to enlist the support of religious and educational leaders, newspaper editors and citizen groups in their communities. The task calls for everyone who can, and will, contribute effort and dedication to it.

I pledge to you that the Post Office Department will lead the way. And if the American people are made properly aware of this challenge, I am confident—as I know you are—that the challenge will be firmly and successfully met.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As protection to children, parents might either be present when mail from unknown sources is opened, or open such mail themselves, carefully explaining to the young addressee the reasons. In addition, parents can prevent children from ordering by mail bargain toys, etc., unless the parent knows or can investigate the advertiser.)

The D.C. General Hospital in Nation's Capital Shows That a City Hospital Is the Ideal Institution for Development of Medical Knowledge and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a city hospital is the ideal institution for the development of medical knowledge and

the enhancement of medical education because no other institution has either the great numbers or variety of clinical material and pathology. In addition, patients with challenging problems can be studied intensively by physicians. Those physicians attracted to a city hospital environment are primarily interested in teaching and research, and the stimulus provided by concomitant medical education makes it imperative that each patient be worked up completely and his disease processes thoroughly understood.

Because of the tremendous interest in teaching and research in a city hospital, the standards of medical care provided the indigent patients are probably much better than those received by the middle-income group and even the wealthy; indigent patients not only have the benefit of being treated by the most outstanding physicians of the community attracted to the hospital, but also receive the latest and most advanced types of medical care because of research which is conducted. As a result of the above considerations, for many years the contributions of city hospitals to medical research and education have been tremendous, and they have played a leading role in providing our citizens, rich or poor, with the highest standards of medical care available anywhere in the world.

Although there have been many significant contributions to medical knowledge from the District of Columbia General Hospital, and many outstanding physicians have worked at this institution, there has never been any formal support for research activities. On the contrary, certain Members of Congress have directed their attention to discouraging research and have questioned the utilization of space at the hospital for such purposes, even making incriminating implications regarding the financing of research projects at the hospital. Money has never been requested from Congress to support research at the hospital because there have never been sufficient appropriations for even the maintenance of decent standards of patient care, and the money obtained through outside sources has been used not only for research, but also to supplement the diagnostic and therapeutic facilities necessary but lacking because of the insufficient appropriations.

It should be clearly evident that an institution so necessary for patient care and teaching must encourage research in order to function effectively, if only to keep abreast of the rapid advances in medicine. Since no appropriation has been available to provide equipment or personnel necessary to introduce modern diagnostic and therapeutic facilities, the District of Columbia has relied completely upon the tremendous interest of the individual medical officers responsible for the operation of the various hospital services. The use of the artificial heart which permits cardiovascular surgery for the large number of patients with congenital heart disease has only

been possible through the research efforts of the medical officers and financial assistance from research grants. Likewise, refrigeration techniques required in certain surgical procedures have also been introduced because of private incentive. The pulmonary function tests, radioisotopes, virus studies, and many others indicated by the enclosed publication list from the hospital, have been made possible only under similar circumstances.

There is obviously a great need for the initiation of a program which will support research at the city hospital of the Nation's capital and which receives encouragement and support from our legislators.

The university hospitals of the District of Columbia, including Georgetown and George Washington University Hospitals, are becoming more and more dependent, not only for their educational programs, but also for research opportunities, upon the city institution. The high cost of medical care has made it exceedingly difficult for the university hospitals to utilize or reserve beds for indigent patients for teaching and research purposes. The tremendous costs of space also make it prohibitive to establish research laboratories within the university hospital. It becomes increasingly apparent, therefore, that the entire future of medical education in this city is dependent upon increasing the opportunities for teaching and research at the District of Columbia General Hospital. The indigent patients will in turn benefit from a closer association with the university hospitals since with improved teaching and greater emphasis on research the standards of medical care must necessarily be raised. The community will profit not only because of more efficient care to the indigent population, but also from the research accomplished at the institution.

It would not take much of an investment, considering the great returns, to provide the support required to improve the teaching and research programs at the District of Columbia General Hospital. This could be accomplished primarily by the construction of a building devoted exclusively for research located in close proximity to the presently available clinical facilities. Specific areas of this building could be set aside for each of the affiliating university hospitals and one area for independent physicians who are interested in pursuing their research interests at the city hospital. The equipment and personnel required for the operation of this building could easily be procured by the universities with money available for research purposes. Construction of such a building exclusively for research purposes has many precedents, and one need only cite Cleveland, Boston, Philadelphia, as examples.

It is hoped that Congress will have the vision to make it possible to utilize the tremendous resources of the District of Columbia General Hospital and establish in the Nation's Capital a city institution that will set high standards for

other similar institutions throughout the country in inpatient care, teaching, and research.

Proof of the pudding is in the eating, and proof of the many significant contributions to medical knowledge and education by the District of Columbia General Hospital is shown by such things as the 293 articles written during the last 5 years by the members of the hospital's staff.

I include here as part of my remarks a bibliography of the 84 articles written during the years 1957-58 alone which eloquently attest to the splendid work which the District of Columbia General Hospital, has done and is doing.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 84 ARTICLES WRITTEN BY THE MEMBERS OF THE STAFF OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GENERAL HOSPITAL DURING 1957-58 ARRANGED BY DEPARTMENTS

ANESTHESIOLOGY

Albert, C. A. Thergaonkar, R. D.; Henley, E. E.; Bain, M.; Raffi, A.; Albert, S. N. "The Value of Blood Volume Determinations in Surgical Procedures." *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 107: 685-689, December 1958.

Albert, S. N.; Spencer, W. A.; Boling, J. S.; Thistlethwaite, J. R.; "Hypothermia in the Management of the Poor-Risk Patient Undergoing Major Surgery." *Journal of American Medical Association*, 163: 1435-1438, April 20, 1957.

Albert, S. N.; Shibuya, J.; Knight, J. F. "A Simple Cooling Unit for Hypothermia." *Anesthesia and Analgesia; Current Researches*, 36: 73, July-August 1957.

Albert, S. N.; Spencer, W. A.; Shibuya, J.; Coakley, C. S.; Thistlethwaite, J. R. "Observations on Fluctuations in Blood Volume as Determined with Radioactive Isotopes." *Anesthesia and Analgesia; Current Researches*, 36: 54-61, September-October 1957.

Albert, S. N.; Spencer, W. A.; Albert, C. A.; Shibuya, J.; Henley, E. E. part I. "Blood Volume Determinations with Radioactive Isotopes and Observations on Blood Volume Fluctuations." Part II. "Index of Cardiac Clearance." *AEC Technical Information Service Extension, Oak Ridge, Tenn.*, March 1958.

Barter, R. H.; Albert, S. N.; Winshel, A. W. "The Use of Hypothermic-Hypotensive Technique in Fulminant Toxemia of Pregnancy." *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 76: 1062-1070, November 1958.

Henley, E. E.; McPhaul, J. J.; Albert, S. N. "Anaphylactic Reaction to Dextran." *Report of a case. Medical Annals of the District of Columbia*, 27: 21-22, January 1958.

Spencer, W. A.; Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Albert, S. N. "A Simplified Method for Blood Volume Determinations Using Radioactive Isotopes." *Surgical Forum*, 7: 3-6, 1957.

Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Spencer, W. A.; Albert, S. N. "Blood Volume Fluctuations Determined by Radioisotopes of Chromium and Radioactive Iodinated Serum Albumin." *Surgery, Gynecology, and Obstetrics*, 105: 34-38, July 1957.

Winshel, A. W.; Nelson, J. H.; Albert, S. N. "Puerperal Gas-Gangrene." *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 9: 481-485, April 1957.

MEDICINE

Alman, R. W., and Fazekas, J. F. "Disparity Between Low Cerebral Blood Flow and Clinical Signs of Cerebral Ischemia." *Neurology*, 7: 555-558, August 1957.

Braun, W. E., and Shnider, B. I. "Alcohol-Induced Pain in Hodgkin's Disease." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 168: 1882-1885, December 6, 1958.

Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Ticktin, H. E.; Fazekas, J. F. "Cerebral Hemodynamics and Metabolism in Accidental Hypothermia." *A.M.A. Archives of Internal Medicine*, 99: 57-59, January 1957.

Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Shea, J. G.; Ticktin, H. E.; Fazekas, J. F. "Influence of Promazine and Methylphenidate on Cerebral Hemodynamics and Metabolism." *A.M.A. Archives of Internal Medicine*, 100: 66-69, July 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ticktin, H. E.; Shea, J. G. "Effect of L-Glutamic Acid on Metabolism of Patients with Hepatic Encephalopathy." *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, 234: 145-149, August 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ticktin, H. E.; Shea, J. G. "Effects of L-Arginine on Hepatic Encephalopathy." *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, 234: 462-467, October 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Shea, J. G.; Ehrmantraut, W. R. "Convulsant Action of Phenothiazine Derivatives." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 165: 1241-1245, November 9, 1957.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Shea, J. G.; Kleh, J. "Cerebral Hemodynamics and Metabolism in Mental Deficiency." *Neurology*, 8: 558-560, July 1958.

Fazekas, J. F. "Pathologic Physiology of Cerebral Dysfunction." *American Journal of Medicine*, 25: 89-96, July 1958.

Fazekas, J. F.; Ehrmantraut, W. R.; Kleh, J. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Certain Anorexic Agents." *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, 236: 692-699, December 1958.

Finnerty, F. A., Jr.; Guillaudeu, R. L.; Fazekas, J. F. "Cardiac and Cerebral Hemodynamics in Drug Induced Postural Collapse." *Circulation Research*, 5: 34-39, January 1957.

Gorman, J. T.; Shnider, B. I.; O'Connor, T. "Hypertrophic Osteoarthropathy.—Report of a Case Associated With Lymphosarcoma." *Medical Annals of the District of Columbia*, 27: 242-245, May 1958.

Kleh, J.; Ehrmantraut, W.; Fazekas, J. F. "Who is Delirious?" *Medical Annals of the District of Columbia*, 27: 593-595, November 1958.

McCurdy, P. R.; Rath, C. E.; Meerkrebs, G. E. "Parenteral Iron Therapy—With Special Reference to a New Preparation for Intramuscular Injection." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 258: 1147-1153, December 12, 1957.

McCurdy, P. R. and Rath, C. E. "Splenectomy in Hemolytic Anemia—Results Predicted by Body Scanning After Injection of Cr⁵¹ Tagged Red Cells." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 259: 459-463, September 4, 1958.

Parrish, Alvin E.; Kleh, J.; Fazekas, J. F. "Renal and Cerebral Hemodynamics With Hypotension." *The American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, 233: 35-39, January 1957.

Rath, C. E.; McCurdy, P. R.; Duffy, B. J., Jr. "Effect of Renal Disease on the Schilling Test." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 256: 111-114, January 17, 1957.

Shea, J. G.; Schultz, J. D.; Lewis, E. Jr.; Fazekas, J. F. "The Clinical and Cerebral Action of Promethazine and Methylphenidate Hydrochloride." *The American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, 235: 201-205, February 1958.

Shnider, B. I.; Frei, E.; Tuohy, J.; Gorman, J.; Freireich, E.; Brindley, C. O.; Clements, J. "Toxicity Studies and Preliminary Clinical Evaluation of 1, 2, 4-Triazine-3, 5-Dione (6-Azauracil)." *Proceedings of the American Association for Cancer Research*, 2: 249, March 1957.

Sugar, S. J. N. "Clinical Experience With More Than 100 Patients Treated With

Orinase." *Medical Annals of the District of Columbia*, 26: 293-297, June 1957.

Sugar, S. J. N. and Thomas, L. J. "Treatment of Diabetes Mellitus With Tolbutamide." *Medical Times*, 26: 981-991, August 1958.

Sugar, S. J. N.; Thomas, L. J.; Tatlier, S. "Management of Diabetes Mellitus with Chlorpropamide—Preliminary Report." *Medical Annals of the District of Columbia*, 27: 445-451, September 1958.

Ticktin, H.; Epstein, J.; Shea, J. G.; Frazekas, J. F. "Effect of Methylphenidate Hydrochloride in Antagonizing Barbiturate-Induced Depression." *Neurology*, 8: 267-271, April 1958.

OBSTETRICS

Barter, R. H.; Fealy, J.; Myles, T. J. M. "Reflections on the Management of 2,500 Breech Presentations." *Southern Medical Journal*, 51: 711-719, June 1958.

Fealy, J.; Nelson, J. H. "Adenocarcinoma in One-Half of a Uterus Didelphys." *Medical Annals of the District of Columbia*, 26: 76-77, February 1957.

Nelson, J. H.; Rovner, I. W.; Barter, R. H. "The Large Baby." *Southern Medical Journal*, 51: 23-26, January 1958.

Winshel, A. W.; Nelson, J. H.; Albert, S. N. "Puerperal Gas Gangrene—Report of a Case." *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 9: 481-484, April 1957.

OPHTHALMOLOGY

Fine, B. S.; Gilligan, J. H. "The Vogt-Koyanagi Syndrome: A Variant of Sympathetic Ophthalmia: Report of Two Cases." *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, 43: 433-440, March 1957.

PATHOLOGY AND LABORATORY MEDICINE

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L. "Intermediary Metabolism of Antibiotic-Resistant and Antibiotic-Sensitive Staphylococci—I: Pyruvate, Glucose and Acetate." *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine*, 94: 212-213, 1957.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L. "Intermediary Metabolism of Antibiotic-Resistant and Antibiotic-Sensitive Staphylococci—II: Oxidation of Glucose Intermediates and Reversal of Resistance Under Anaerobiosis." *Antibiotics and Chemotherapy*, 8: 21-26, January 1958.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L.; Possehl, C. D. "Mg Inactivation of Antibiotics—I: Clinical Laboratory Applications and Theoretical Interpretations Regarding Antibiotic Synergy." *American Journal of Clinical Pathology*, 27: 534-538, June 1957.

Dozier, S. M.; Fusillo, M. H.; Woodham, G. E. "Demonstration of Circulating Antibodies to M. Tuberculosis in Humans—I: Technique. Theoretical Considerations and Development of a New Concept of Antibody Assay as Applied to Tuberculosis." *American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases*, 75: 949-953, June 1957.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L.; Dozier, S. M. "Demonstration of Circulating Antibodies to M. Tuberculosis in Humans—II: Clinical Laboratory Studies—The Existence of Specific Circulating Antibody in Patients With Active Tuberculosis." *American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases*, 75: 954-957, June 1957.

Fusillo, M. H.; Weiss, D. L. "Considerations of False Positive Reactions in the Globulin Titration Technique as Applied to Tuberculosis." *American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases*, 76: 507-508, September 1958.

Reiner, M. "The Role of Electrophoresis in Medicine." *International Record of Medicine*, 170: 374-387, July 1957.

Weiss, D. L. "An Approach to an Atherogenic Factor—Transintimal Perfusion."

Journal of the Mount Sinai Hospital, 24: 1346-1351, November-December 1957.

PEDIATRICS

Asteriadiou-Samartzis, E.; Leikin, S. "The Relation of Vitamin K to Hyperbilirubinemia." *Pediatrics*, 21: 395-402, March 1958.

Leikin, S. L.; McCoo, J. W. "Sickle-Cell Anemia in Infancy." *A.M.A. Journal of Diseases of Children*, 96: 51-57, July 1958.

Leikin, S. L.; Rheingold, J. J.; Sites, J. G. "Frequency of ABO Erythroblastosis." *Pediatrics*, 22: 65-71, July 1958.

PHYSICAL MEDICINE AND REHABILITATION

Buchanan, J. J.; Sexton, M. (collaborators). "Strike Back at Stroke." Public Health Service Publication No. 596, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958.

PULMONARY DISEASE

Berman, I. B. and Katz, S. "Kanamycin Nephrotoxicity." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 76: 149-156, September 30, 1958.

Donohoe, R. F.; Katz, S.; Matthews, M. J. "Aspiration Biopsy of the Parietal Pleura—Results in Forty-Five Cases." *American Journal of Medicine*, 22: 883-893, June 1957.

Donohoe, R. F. "The Role of Pleural Biopsy in the Study of Patients with Pleural Effusions." *Bulletin of the Georgetown University Medical Center*, 10: 183-188, July 1957.

Donohoe, R. F.; Katz, S.; Matthews, M. J. "Pleural Biopsy as an Aid in the Etiologic Diagnosis of Pleural Effusion: Review of the Literature and Report of 132 Biopsies." *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 48: 344-362, February 1958.

Katz, S. "Actinomycosis." *GP*, 15: 94-95, January 1957.

Katz, S. "Coccidioidomycosis." *GP*, 15: 107, February 1957.

Katz, S. "Superior Sulcus Tumor (Pancoast Tumor)." *GP*, 15: 93, April 1957.

Katz, S. "Intralobar Pleural Effusion." *GP*, 16: 92, July 1957.

Katz, S. "Linear Atelectasis." *GP*, 16: 108-109, August 1957.

Katz, S. "Bronchogenic Cysts." *GP*, 16: 97, September 1957.

Katz, S. "Intralobar Bronchopulmonary Sequstration." *GP*, 16: 112-113, October 1957.

Katz, S. "Artifacts." *GP*, 16: 96-97, December 1957.

Katz, S. "Accessory Lobes of the Lung." *GP*, 16: 85, December 1957.

Katz, S. "The Azygos Vein." *GP*, 17: 120, January 1958.

Katz, S. "Congenital Diaphragmatic Herniation of the Liver." *GP*, 17: 130, February 1958.

Katz, S. "Parasternal Hernia." *GP*, 18: 109, August 1958.

Katz, S. "Septal Lines." *GP*, 18: 86, September 1958.

Katz, S. "The Sign of Patent Bronchus." *GP*, 18: 132, October 1958.

Katz, S. "Traumatic Saccular Aneurysm of the Thoracic Aorta." *GP*, 18: 147, November 1958.

Katz, S. "Some Infrequently Emphasized Causes of Pleural Effusion." *GP*, 18: 138, December 1958.

Katz, S. "Current Concepts in Therapy: Antibiotics—VIII: Chemotherapy of Tuberculosis." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 259: (1) 536-538, September 11, 1958; (2), 732-734, October 9, 1958; (3), 976-978, November 13, 1958.

Leonard, J. J.; Katz, S.; McCormick, G. "Recurrent Military Tuberculosis." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 258: 435-441, March 7, 1957.

Leonard, J. J.; Katz, S.; Nelson, D. "Calcification of the Left Atrium; Its Anatomic Location, Diagnostic Significance, and Roentgenologic Demonstration." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 256: 629-633, April 4, 1957.

Moser, K. M. "Intramuscular Injection of Trypsin: Its Value as a Thrombolytic and Anti-Inflammatory Agent." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 256: 258-263, February 7, 1957; 303-309, February 14, 1957.

Moser, K. M. and Shea, J. G. "The Relationship Between Pulmonary Infarction, Cor Pulmonale and the Sickle States." *American Journal of Medicine*, 22: 561-579, April 1957.

Peabody, J. W.; Katz, S.; Davis, E. W.; Stone, J. C. "The So-Called Tuberculoma—A Reappraisal." *Bulletin of the Georgetown*

University Medical Center, 10: 141-146, May 1957.

RADIOLOGY

Gondos, Bela. "Observations on Periarthritis Calcarea." *American Journal of Roentgenology, Radium Therapy, and Nuclear Medicine*, 77: 93-108, January 1957.

Gondos, Bela. "Tennis Elbow: A Reevaluation." *American Journal of Roentgenology, Radium Therapy, and Nuclear Medicine*, 79: 684-691, April 1958.

Donahue, J. K.; Hunter, C.; Balch, H. H. "Significance of Fluid Levels in X-Ray Films of the Abdomen." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 259: 13-15, July 3, 1958.

SURGERY

Donahue, J. K.; Balch, H. H. "Calcifying Epithelioma of Malherbe: Report of a Case."

Bulletin of the Georgetown University Medical Center, 11: 74-77, January 1958.

Donahue, J. K.; Hunter, C.; Balch, H. H. "Significance of Fluid Levels in X-Ray Films of the Abdomen." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 259: 13-15, July 3, 1958.

Spencer, W. A.; Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Albert, S. N. "A Simplified Method for Blood Volume Determinations Using Radioactive Isotopes." *Surgical Forum*, 7: 3-6, 1957.

Thistlethwaite, J. R.; Spencer, W. A.; Albert, S. N. "Blood Volume Fluctuations Determined by Radioisotopes of Chromium and Radioactive Iodinated Serum Albumin." *Surgery, Gynecology, and Obstetrics*, 105: 34-38, July 1957.

Thistlethwaite, J. R. "The New Hormone-Producing Tumors." *West Virginia Medical Journal*, 54: 329-335, September 1958.